

5
No. 1289.

THE CATHEDRAL LIBRARY

—OF THE—

Episcopal Church

Denver, Colorado.

PRESENTED BY

Bishop Spalding.

PRESENTED

BY THE

Bishop White Parish Library Association

OF

PHILADELPHIA.

To the Rector and Vestry
Church of *Spokane* for
use of the Rector for the time being.

THIRTY-NINE ARTICLES

St. John's College,
Greeley, Colo.

OXFORD UNIVERSITY

JOHN J. LUTHER LIBRARY
THE UNIVERSITY OF CHICAGO
220 CH. UNIVERSITY
CHICAGO, ILL. 60607

TESTIMONIES
OF THE
FATHERS OF THE FIRST FOUR CENTURIES
TO THE DOCTRINE AND DISCIPLINE
OF THE CHURCH OF ENGLAND
AS SET FORTH IN THE
THIRTY-NINE ARTICLES.

BY THE
REV. HENRY CARY, M. A.
OF WORCESTER COLL. OXFORD.



OXFORD: D. A. TALBOYS,

M DCCC XXXV.

IRA J. TAYLOR LIBRARY
THE ILIFF SCHOOL OF THEOLOGY
2233 SO. UNIVERSITY BLVD.
DENVER, COLORADO 80210

~~458.3~~
~~C33~~
St. John's College,
Gresley, Colo.

PREFACE.

A principle which especially characterises the Church of England, and distinguishes her from every other reformed communion, is her marked and avowed adherence to the Catholic faith as received in the primitive and purest ages of Christianity. She has acted on this universally acknowledged truth, that whatsoever is new in the fundamentals of religion, must be false. On this ground, and believing that in the earliest ages the great truths of Christianity were known to, and plainly professed by the Church, she (as is said by a late most eminent and pious prelate) "in the first instance, and as her grand foundation, derives all obligatory matter of faith, that is, to use her own expression, all 'that is to be believed for necessity of salvation,' from the Scripture alone: and herein she differs from the Church of Rome. But she systematically resorts to the concurrent sense of the Church Catholic, both for assistance in the interpretation of the sacred text, and for guidance in those matters of religion, which the text has left at large: and herein she differs from every reformed communion ^a."

This peculiarity of our Church, though known

^a DR. JEBB, Bishop of Limerick. *Peculiar character of the Church of England.*

to, and in more than one instance commended by learned foreign divines, not members of our communion, has unfortunately, of late years, been little regarded by the generality of our own clergy.

It is more with a view to invite them to these storehouses of divine knowledge, than for the purpose of controversy, that this volume is offered to the public. The many varieties of opinion that unhappily exist among ourselves, as to the proper interpretation of particular passages of Scripture, could not be otherwise than very much diminished, if not entirely removed, would we but follow that path so plainly pointed out to us by the authoritative records of our own Church; viz. would we yield our own private interpretations to the sense of the Church Catholic, wherever that can be ascertained.

We should not still have to learn that “no prophecy of the Scripture is of any private interpretation. For the prophecy came not in old time by the will of man: but holy men of God spake as they were moved by the Holy Ghost^b:” an inspired rule, which, though in its first intention applicable to the prophets and apostles, yet when connected with our Lord’s promise to be with his Church “always, even unto the end of the world,” may well be applied to the Church, in those times particularly when the presence of the Holy Spirit was most manifest.

^b 2 Pet. i. 20, 21.

With a view, therefore, to shew the use and authority of the Fathers, it may be desirable, first of all to enquire how far we, the clergy, are bound by our ordination vows to search into and uphold the primitive faith: and secondly, to justify and explain the obligation imposed upon us. The first subject of enquiry is short and simple, and cannot be gainsayed by any amongst ourselves. The second is rather addressed to those who maintain the interpretation of Scripture by Scripture only, to those who would fathom the depths by the same plummet that sounds the shallows.

For the first point then; "Let preachers take heed that they never teach any thing from the pulpit, to be religiously held and believed by the people, except what is agreeable to the doctrine of the Old or New Testament, and which the Catholic Fathers and ancient Bishops have collected out of the same doctrine^c."

To this nothing need be added except the observation, that the same rule which is thus laid down for our guidance as to matters of faith, has been observed by our Church in matters of practice and ceremonial observances. Thus the preface to the Book of Common Prayer, "Concerning the Service of the Church," begins by directing us to search out by the ancient Fathers, for the original

^c Imprimis vero videbunt [Concionatores] nè quid unquam doceant pro concione, quod à populo religiosè teneri et credi velint, nisi quod consentaneum sit doctrinæ Veteris aut Novi Testamenti, quodque ex illâ ipsâ doctrinâ Catholici Patres et veteres Episcopi collegerint. *Coll. Canon.* Lond. 1691. p. 238.

and ground of divine service ; saying, “ There was never any thing by the wit of man so well devised, or so sure established, which in continuance of time hath not been corrupted : As among other things it may plainly appear by the Common Prayers in the Church, commonly called *Divine Service*. The first original and ground whereof, if a man would search out by the ancient Fathers, he shall find, that the same was not ordained but for a good purpose, and for a great advancement of godliness.”

Again, in the next paragraph of the same Preface, we are told, that the “ godly and decent order of the Fathers hath been altered, broken, and neglected :” and presently we read concerning the Book of Common Prayer itself, “ here you have an order for Prayer, and for the reading of the Holy Scripture, much agreeable to the mind and purpose of the old Fathers ^d.”

Such then being the rule for the interpretation of Scripture, which our Church has imposed upon her clergy, and she, in the ordering of her Public Services, having followed the pattern of the primitive Churches, so far as the difference of circumstances, times, and manners would admit ; it is worth while to enquire, Secondly, into the grounds of her having shewn such deference to antiquity.

And here, were I to begin by asserting the *authority* of the Church, and to insist on that

^d In proof of this I must again refer, as I have elsewhere done, to the Rev. W. PALMER's *Antiquities of the English Ritual*.

principle, that the Church is the proper interpreter of Holy Writ,—a principle, which until the Reformation was never questioned, though in practice, and from the corruptions which for some centuries before had been creeping into the Church, it had been utterly perverted—were I to insist on this principle, the truth would come in a shape so objectionable to many amongst us, that, in the heat of opposition, even that credit, which cannot reasonably be denied to the Fathers by the most determined latitudinarian, would be withheld from them.

If then we waive, for the present, the question of authority, and consider the Fathers only in the light of witnesses, we cannot but admit that they are the best witnesses of the doctrines taught, and the discipline introduced by the Apostles.

The credibility of their testimony will depend on their “ability and integrity; their *ability* in the knowledge of that which they deliver and assert: their integrity in delivering and asserting according to their knowledge^e.”

First, then, as to their *ability*.

It must be admitted that the immediate successors of the Apostles, and those who constantly conversed with them, and were by them set over the Churches which they established, must have known all that was necessary to be believed unto salvation: and conversely that whatsoever was not known to them, cannot be necessary to be known or believed. It cannot be doubted that the Apostles explained by word of mouth to the early

^e PEARSON, *on the Creed*, Art. i.

bishops, the whole scheme of salvation through Christ, otherwise they could not have been fit persons to establish and set in order the Churches; for when St Paul writes to Timothy, "the things that thou hast heard of me among many witnesses, the same commit thou to faithful men, who shall be able to teach others also," the Scriptures of the New Testament had not all been written; not that they taught any doctrines which are not now to be found in Scripture; but they must have taught all necessary doctrine and explained it too.

If, therefore, we could certainly ascertain all that the Apostolic Fathers did believe, we should as certainly come to the knowledge of all necessary truth. And though thus far confining ourselves to the remains of the Apostolic Fathers, that have come down to our times, we shall not have their sense of the whole of Scripture, yet as far as their teaching extends, we have their faith, and consequently the true faith, which they, under the immediate teaching of the Apostles themselves, derived from the sacred oracles.

Though in the Apostolic age doubts had not yet been raised on all those points which now divide and distract the Church of Christ, yet they must have known, whether the Father, Son, and Holy Ghost are three persons, and one God; whether they are to be equally worshipped; whether faith without a holy life would lead to salvation; whether works are in themselves meritorious; whether we can do good works acceptable to God without the assistance of the Holy Spirit; whether the Holy

Spirit will guide us without our own endeavours; whether the sacraments are necessary, and what are their effects; whether baptism is an empty sign of that which does not exist, or whether it confers any inward graces; whether the elements in the Lord's Supper are bread and wine, or literal flesh and blood: all these subjects must have been known to the cotemporaries and appointed successors of the Apostles, and on all these some one or other of them have left something which will shew us what their faith was.

Again, they could not be ignorant of what was the discipline established by the Apostles; almost all those, whose writings we now have, were either bishops or presbyters in the Church; the earliest of them were appointed to the ministry by the Apostles themselves; and we may reasonably conclude that the same instructions and the same discretionary power, which we find St. Paul gave to Timothy and to Titus, were also given to others, who were set over other Churches. The principal point, on which the question of Church discipline must depend, is, whether or not the Apostles believed that our Saviour instituted a peculiar order of men for performing the offices of the priesthood; whether the Apostles themselves did set in order the Churches in obedience to such institution; and if so, what orders they, under the guidance of the Holy Spirit, did establish? It is said that the Scriptures are not so clear on this point, as to bind the Church to a particular course of succession and definite gradations: but the bishops, whom the

Apostles themselves set over the Churches, could not but have known what power was entrusted to themselves; whether the offices of bishop and presbyter differed only in name; or whether the former only had the power and were commanded to choose and ordain others to the inferior orders. If they did know these things, which cannot surely be denied, then one of them, at least, has left us sufficient to shew, where we are to look for the true ministers of the Church, and what their constitution must be; this one is Ignatius, bishop of Antioch, (and I would add a second, Clemens, bishop of Rome,) the prominent subject of whose several Epistles is the necessity of union and communion, of obedience to the bishop, and the due subordination of the three orders of bishops, priests, and deacons.

With the Apostles for their teachers they must have known better than we at this day can, what was the meaning of the Scriptures; what doctrines the Apostles taught, and what rules they laid down. And if we find that the same ecclesiastical discipline was observed for many successive centuries, we cannot doubt that such was in accordance with the Apostolic institution. If the Scriptures do not distinctly lay down any particular system of Church government, where but to the earliest writers are we to look for the framework of the Apostolic Churches? It is answered, that the silence of Scripture shews it not to be essential. But it is essential, if the avoiding of divisions and schism is so. And the Apostles must have so considered it, or we should not find such uniformity

in the Apostolic Churches of Alexandria, Antioch, Jerusalem, Corinth, and Rome.

The very objection moreover, above alluded to, that the Scriptures do not impose any necessary form of Church government, so far from giving a license to every man's private fancy, makes it more incumbent on us to enquire in what way the Apostles constituted the Churches; what rites and customs they established. It is impossible that they should have left the Church in that state, that it should be necessary, wherever the Gospel should be received, for each congregation to devise a scheme of Church government, and to provide for the performance of the public services, and the celebration of the divine mysteries. Had such been the case, we should find a difference in these particulars suited to the difference of national habits and customs in various parts of the world: but so far is this from being the case, that we find an exact uniformity in all essential matters, in every Church established for several subsequent centuries, whether in Europe, Asia, or Africa.

Having thus shewn the *ability*, or means of knowledge, possessed by the early Fathers I must in the next place, say a few words on their *integrity*.

How can that be questioned? or why should not the same degree of credit be given to them, that there is to other historians? Even this indulgence would be conclusive: but when it is added that many of them evinced their earnestness in the cause, their devotion to the truth, by

patiently bearing with the most severe persecutions, and submitting to the most cruel deaths, the sincerity of their faith, and consequently the unimpeachableness of their testimony, stands on higher ground than that of ordinary writers. This argument, which has been ably used for the purpose of establishing the truth of Christianity itself, may certainly be adduced to shew that the early martyrs believed what they taught, that they did not knowingly teach what was false. And if this be added to what has been just insisted on, that they did, in fact, know the whole truth, we have all that can be required in human testimony, the ability and integrity of the witnesses established.

But if we view the Fathers in the lowest possible light, they are surely valuable as cotemporary writers: there are many allusions in the New Testament to rites and customs peculiar to those times, with which the Fathers must have been familiar; these it is impossible to understand without applying to external sources of information: and may we not use the Fathers in the interpretation of such passages of Scripture, in the same way, and to the same extent, that we constantly use cotemporary writers to illustrate heathen rites, or to interpret ancient laws? And, if we may do this, what becomes of the dogma, that Scripture is to be interpreted only by Scripture? How should we interpret that verse in the Revelations, xv. 3., where we are told that the saints “sing the song of Moses, the servant of God?” The song referred to is evidently that in Exodus xv.; but when it is

shewn from other sources that the Jews in those times, and long before, were accustomed to sing that song in their Sabbath evening service, the allusion is full and complete ; for now we learn why the saints shall sing it, viz. because they are now come to their everlasting Sabbath, having gotten the victory over the beast, and over his image, and over his mark, and over the number of his name, and having the harps of God in their hands^f.

Having got thus far, the step is natural and easy to the interpretation of those words of St. Paul to Timothy, "I put thee in remembrance that thou stir up the gift of God, which is in thee by the putting on of my hands : ^g" and of that other, before quoted, "the same commit thou to faithful men." And then will follow that which was before insisted on, that the early Fathers knew what was the form of Church government established by the Apostles.

Thus far my remarks have been confined to the Apostolic Fathers. I shall presently shew that their successors are equally deserving of credit : but in the mean time must avail myself of their assistance to prove that the Church is a witness and keeper of holy writ.

It is the constant doctrine of the Fathers, that the Apostles appointed those, as their successors, who were suggested to them by the Holy Ghost ; that to them was committed the Canon of Scripture, the Catholic faith, and Apostolical discipline.

^f See LIGHTFOOT'S *Temple Service*, c. vii. p. 59.

^g 2 Tim. i. 6.

Clemens of Rome mentions that the Apostles appointed those to be bishops and deacons, who were “proved by the Holy Ghost;” and in a subsequent page he says, that they “gave directions for the future, how, when they should die, other approved men might succeed to their ministry^h.”

To the passages from Ignatius, which will be found under the twenty-third Article, may be added that from his Epistle to the Church at Philadelphia, in which he says that the blood of Christ is our eternal and abiding joy, “especially if we be in unity with the bishop and his fellow-presbyters, and deacons, appointed after the mind of Christ, whom he hath according to his own will established in all confidence, *by his Holy Spirit*ⁱ.”

Irenæus, as I have elsewhere observed^k, gives the succession of bishops in the see of Rome, from the time of the Apostles: and in the same chapter he says: “We are able to reckon up those who were appointed bishops in the Churches by the Apostles, and their successors to our times, who neither taught, nor knew, any such thing as these [heretics] madly prate about. For if the Apostles had known any hidden mysteries, which they taught to the perfect separately and secretly from the rest, they would have delivered such things to those

^h Both the passages here alluded to will be found under Article xxiii. p. 280.

ⁱ IGNAT. *ad Philad.* init. Μάλιστα ἐὰν ἐν ἐνὶ ᾧσιν σὺν τῷ Ἐπισκόπῳ, καὶ τοῖς σὺν αὐτῷ Πρεσβυτέροις καὶ Διακόνοις, ἀποδεδειγμένοις ἐν γνώμῃ Ἰησοῦ Χριστοῦ, οὕς κατὰ τὸ ἴδιον θέλημα ἐστήριξεν ἐν βεβαιωσύνῃ τῷ Ἁγίῳ αὐτοῦ Πνεύματι.

^k Art. xxiii. p. 281.

especially, to whom they committed the Churches themselves. For they wished that those should be by all means perfect and blameless, whom they left as their successors, and to whom they delivered their own place in the government of the Church¹."

Clemens of Alexandria also says, that the Apostles appointed those to the ministry, "who were signified to them by the Holy Ghost^m."

Tertullian in many places mentions the succession of bishops, that to the Church was entrusted the Catholic faith, and the ecclesiastical disciplineⁿ."

To the Churches, thus established by the Apostles, was committed the Canon of Scripture, not indeed by the Apostles who founded them, for at the period of their foundation all the books of the New Testament were not written, but copies of the several Epistles were from time to time transmitted from one Church to the others, and the latter had the same means of ascertaining their genuineness and authenticity, that we should now have of any public document, coming from a foreign country: besides which, the bishops having been instructed by the Apostles themselves, as was be-

¹ IRENÆI *adv. Hæres.* l. iii. c. 3. s. 1. Habemus annumerare eos qui ab Apostolis instituti sunt Episcopi in Ecclesiis, et successores eorum usque ad nos, qui nihil tale docuerunt, neque cognoverunt, quale ab his deliratur. Etenim si recondita mysteria scissent Apostoli, quæ seorsim et latenter ab reliquis perfectos docebant, his vel maximè traderent ea quibus etiam ipsas Ecclesias committebant. Valde enim perfectos et irreprehensibiles in omnibus eos volebant esse, quos et successores relinquebant suum ipsorum locum magisterii tradentes.

^m See Art. xxiii. p. 282.

ⁿ See passages from Tertullian under Articles vi., xxiii., and xxxvii.

fore observed, were thoroughly conversant in all necessary doctrine, though they had not yet the whole of Scripture. Without supposing this interchange of the sacred writings, it is impossible to account for the general agreement amongst all the Churches in the formation of the sacred Canon^o.

The Churches however had not only the custody and guardianship of Scripture, they were always deemed to be its proper interpreters; this was the only check, and a very necessary one too, on the license of private interpretation; and at the same time also particular Churches were by the same means prevented from promulgating "erroneous and strange doctrines," for each must take not its own private sense, but that of the Church Catholic throughout the world.

Accordingly, the ordinary method of confuting the many heresies that arose in those times, was by appeal to the doctrines maintained in the Apostolic Churches. Such is the line of argument adopted by Irenæus throughout his five books against Heresies; and of Tertullian against Marcion, and Praxeas, and in his book concerning Præscriptions.

The same course was observed in matters of discipline; for while the utmost liberty was allowed, not indeed to private individuals, but to the Bishops and governing body of each Church, in

^o I would observe here, what, for the sake of avoiding being tedious, I have forborne to enlarge upon, that, to answer the question, What is Scripture? all who call themselves Christians must have recourse to the Fathers.

things that were not essential, in all that concerned the substance of public worship and the celebration of the sacraments the most entire agreement was observed. But particularly the utmost pains were taken to preserve inviolate the Apostolical succession of bishops, and other ministers in the Church, so that in instances where persons procured themselves to be improperly chosen and ordained, the neighbouring Churches invariably refused to communicate with them, or to acknowledge them as rightful bishops.

As well to enforce the foregoing arguments, as in addition to them, it should be borne in mind, that during the first three centuries, at least, the divine author of our religion thought fit to continue in considerable measure in his Church, for the propagation of his Gospel, the extraordinary aids of the Holy Spirit. The Apostles chose their successors under the direction of the Holy Ghost; some of those who were so chosen, and also some of those who followed them, manifested these extraordinary gifts; so that we seem driven to the alternative either of admitting the truth, in general, of the doctrines such men taught, or of denying the fact of their possessing such gifts. But if we attempt the latter, we must at once deny all credit to the histories of those times; we must not regard them as Christians, but as impostors—a course which none but an infidel would dare to venture upon. It is remarkable, moreover, that we have no account that any of the early heretics disputed this position; they never denied the continuance of

miraculous powers in the Church ; they never denied Apostolical traditions as the interpreters of Scripture : so far from it, they pretended that their's was the Apostolical tradition, and were refuted only by an appeal to those Churches, which were planted by the Apostles themselves. And the schismatics followed the same course in claiming to themselves the Apostolical succession.

The question may now be proposed, whether what was deemed essential then, has ceased to be so now ?

Having shewn that the early successors of the Apostles had better means, than we have, of learning what the true faith is ; that to them was committed the sacred volume ; that they were commissioned by the Apostles themselves to set in order the Churches, and to establish its internal discipline : we must admit, (unless it be denied that they had the true faith,) that those who, in the present day, differ from them, cannot have that faith which is in Jesus, for we know that there is but “ one Lord, one faith, one baptism^p.” When we see, as the fact now is, that the same passages of Scripture which involve the fundamental doctrines of Christianity, receive very different and opposite interpretations from different persons and sects, can we do otherwise than appeal to those times, which all must admit to have been more pure and scriptural in faith and practice ? As the faith is one, so must the Catholic Church be one,

^p Eph. iv. 5.

not one to-day and another to-morrow, but always the same, flowing from one fountain, and though divided into many streams, yet all running into the boundless ocean of eternity.

It may now be objected, that, if the above arguments are admitted to their utmost extent, the authority claimed for the early writers of the Church must be limited to the Apostolic age; and that all subsequent testimony must be derivative, and therefore be placed on the footing of hearsay evidence. But, though in the proof of an isolated fact, the testimony of twenty, who have only heard it from one, resolves itself into the testimony of that one, yet it is otherwise in the matters of which we are now treating; for every succeeding witness gives strength to the evidence of the first. For here we have the faith expressed in a certain form of words, the books from which this form is deduced, the various ceremonies observed in the performance of religious rites, all maintained by a succession of men, one after another filling the same offices, and appealing to the faith and practice of those who preceded them, which could not but be known to a great many of those who were cotemporaries of both. And not only this, we have Churches established in different and distant parts of the world, at the very beginning of the foundation of Christianity, and in the second, third, and fourth centuries, we find these Churches rapidly multiplying to a vast extent, and yet all referring to the same authority, of Scripture indeed, but as interpreted by their predecessors, and

all moreover agreeing in the same interpretation.

To this point then, as Tertullian says, I would direct prescription—wherever the Church *agrees* in the interpretation, there should the interpretation be received as true. This agreement may be shewn either from General Councils, universally approved, or from Catholic writers, of whose faith question was never made in times when heretical tenets were no sooner published than condemned. Of the former, but little use has been made in this work, for, in the first place, they would have taken me into a field which it was not my design to tread; and in the next, to some persons whatever comes in the shape of authority is therefore objectionable. Of the latter, the Catholic writers, it must be admitted that their authority consists in their agreement; they were all subject to error, but as witnesses, shewing what was the faith of the Catholic Church, in those its purest ages, their testimony is invaluable: we look to them not for their individual opinions, but for the sense of the whole Church of which they were distinguished ornaments.

It remains that I should add a few words on the contents of this volume. It does not profess to be a full collection of authorities on any point: the strongest passages have been selected, and in very many instances those which have been adduced by other writers for the same purpose: for I did not think any the worse of a quotation because another had used it before me, nor did I desire, by an af-

fectionation of novelty, to get credit for more research than the occasion required. Accordingly, I have borrowed largely from the labours of Cranmer, Bishops Beveridge, and Tomline, Wall, Bingham, and Welchman, though in all cases the original works have been consulted, and search made in them for other passages.

A separate acknowledgment is due to Dr. Burton, Regius Professor of Divinity at Oxford, for his having kindly permitted me to avail myself of his labours. Almost all the extracts in the first five Articles of this work, are taken from his two volumes of "Testimonies."

To the Rev. W. Palmer, author of the *Origines Liturgicæ*, I am indebted for many valuable suggestions, especially on those points where I found most difficulty.

For the use of those who are not much acquainted with the lives and writings of the Fathers, a brief notice is subjoined of the authors whose testimony is made use of in this work.

APOSTOLIC FATHERS.

BARNABAS, the earliest of the Apostolical Fathers, is the same that is so frequently mentioned in the Acts and St. Paul's Epistles. He was a Levite and a native of the isle of Cyprus. The epistle which we have of his, is frequently quoted by Clements Alexandrinus and Origen. Some of the Fathers placed it

among the apocryphal books of the New Testament. But several modern writers have considered it spurious.

CLEMENS ROMANUS, whom St. Paul mentions as one of his "fellow-labourers, whose names are in the book of life," was bishop of Rome in the first century. At what precise date he was appointed to that see has been much questioned: some have placed it as early as A. D. 61; others as late as 93. Irenæus^a tells us he was the third bishop, Linus and Anencletus having preceded him. Several works have been falsely attributed to him. His Epistle to the Corinthians, however, is undoubtedly genuine; it is quoted by many of the Fathers, and particularly Irenæus describes it so exactly as to leave no doubt that it is the same which we now have.

HERMAS. St. Paul, in Rom. xvi. 14. makes mention of a Christian of this name, and ancient authors always attributed the book entitled 'The Shepherd,' to him. But several modern critics have rejected it as spurious, and have considered it to be the production of Hermes, brother to Pius, bishop of Rome in the second century. But the objection, if it arises only from the difference of name, is entirely futile; for in the very same verse where St. Paul mentions Hermas, he also speaks of another by the name of Hermes. To my mind the testimony of Jerome is conclusive, where he says that the book is almost unknown to the Latins; whereas it is not at all probable that a Latin, as Hermes, the brother of Pius, was, would have written in Greek, nor that the work of a Latin, which was so well known to the Greek writers, would have been so little known to the Latins. The work is quoted with respect by Irenæus, Clemens Alexandrinus, Origen, Eusebius, Athanasius, and Jerome.

IGNATIUS, surnamed Theophorus, succeeded Euodius in the see of Antioch, about the year of our Lord 70. He was appointed by one of the apostles, either St. Peter or St. Paul; and, in the reign of Trajan, having presided over that Church for about forty years, was condemned to be exposed to wild beasts

^a Lib. iii. c. iii. sect. 3.

in the amphitheatre at Rome. Seven epistles of his have reached our times; they were all written while he was being carried prisoner from Antioch to Rome, and consequently not long before his martyrdom. They are addressed to the Churches of Ephesus, Magnesia, Tralles, Rome, Philadelphia, and Smyrna; and to his fellow-martyr Polycarp. Bishop Pearson^b has unanswerably removed all doubts as to the genuineness of these epistles.

POLYCARP was born about the year of our Lord 70, and while he was yet a boy became the disciple of St. John, who, after his return from Patmos, (consequently before A. D. 101,) ordained him bishop of Smyrna. After having devoted a long life to the service of the Church, he suffered martyrdom, with the utmost cheerfulness and constancy, in the seventh year of the emperor Marcus Aurelius, A. D. 167. Irenæus^c mentions that he himself had seen Polycarp in his early youth, and that he was made bishop of Smyrna by the apostles; he says of him, that "he always taught those things which he had learnt from the apostles, which also the Church delivers, and which alone are true." He mentions particularly his Epistle to the Philippians, which we now have, "from which," he adds, "those who please, and who have a regard to their own salvation, may learn the character of his faith, and the preaching of the true doctrine^d." He also refers to several other epistles, which were written either to neighbouring Churches, or to some of his brethren.

SECOND CENTURY.

JUSTIN MARTYR was a native of Flavia Neapolis, anciently called Sychem, in Samaria. He was of Grecian origin, and mentions himself, that having studied the philosophy of the heathens, he at length was made a convert to Christianity; this is supposed

^b *Vindiciæ Epistolarum S. Ignatii.*

^c *Adv. Hæres. lib. iii. c. iii. sect. 4.*

^d *Idem ibid.*

to have taken place about A. D. 133, when he was about forty-three years of age. Being at Rome during the persecution in the reign of Antoninus Pius, he wrote his first Apology for the Christians; he says that it was then about 150 years from the birth of Christ. His second Apology was written some considerable time after the first: the exact period is not known, but probably not long before his martyrdom. After the first and before the second Apology, he went from Rome, and in Asia held his celebrated disputation with Trypho the Jew. The above are undoubtedly the works of Justin, many others have been wrongly attributed to him. The epistle to Diognetus, which I have once quoted, is by many persons supposed not to have been his; Eusebius does not mention it, but does those before named; its antiquity, however, is generally admitted. Justin suffered martyrdom in the reign of Marcus Antoninus, about A. D. 164, or as others say, 166, or 168.

TATIAN was a native of Assyria, and, as Irenæus tells us, a disciple of Justin Martyr: after the death of his master he fell into heresy, and became one of the founders of a new sect, called the Encratites. We learn from Eusebius that he was the author of many works, of which, however, only one survives, the '*Oratio contra Græcos*.'

ATHENAGORAS flourished in the times of Hadrian and Antoninus Pius: but very little is known about him; Eusebius does not mention him, but Epiphanius does. He wrote an Apology for the Christians, which was presented either to M. Aurel. Antoninus and L. Aurel. Commodus, or to M. Antoninus and L. Verus; the latter opinion seems most probable, which places this author about A. D. 178. There is another treatise attributed to him, '*Concerning the Resurrection of the Dead*.'

THEOPHILUS was the sixth bishop of Antioch, as Eusebius informs us, having been ordained to that see about A. D. 168 or 170. He died about A. D. 181. The only works of his, which we now have, are three books addressed to his friend Autolychnus, whom he endeavours to instruct in, and bring over to, the Chris-

tian faith. We learn from Eusebius and Jerome that he wrote a book against Marcion, and another against the heresy of Hermogenes, besides other short treatises.

MELITO, bishop of Sardes in Asia, about A. D. 170, seems to have written very considerably on the doctrine and discipline of the Church^e; only a few fragments of his works, however, have reached our times; they are collected in Dr. Routh's *Reliquiæ Sacræ*.

IRENÆUS, a Greek, probably of Asia, seems to have been brought up from childhood in the Christian faith; in a letter to Florinus, cited by Eusebius^f, he mentions his having been with Polycarp in Asia, when he was yet but a child; and we learn the same fact from his third book against Heretics, c. iii. The period of his birth is usually placed about A. D. 140. From Asia he went to Gaul, and there became a presbyter under Pothinus, bishop of Lyons, whether ordained by him or not is uncertain: and in the year 177, on the martyrdom of Pothinus, he was chosen to succeed him. Gregory of Tours^g is the only ancient writer who relates that Irenæus suffered martyrdom; but there does not seem to be sufficient reason for crediting his account in opposition to the general silence of antiquity. His five books against heresies are all that remain of his writings; and these are chiefly preserved in a very bad Latin translation. The portions of the Greek that still survive serve to shew, with the ignorance of the translator, his general accuracy.

THIRD CENTURY.

CLEMENS ALEXANDRINUS, (whose proper name was Titus Flavius Clemens,) was a presbyter of Alexandria, and a disciple of Pantænus, whom he succeeded as president of the catechetical

^e The titles of them are in Euseb. lib. iv. c. 26.

^f Lib. v. c. 20.

^g Hist. c. 27.

school of Alexandria, about A. D. 190. His works which we now have are, an Exhortation to the Gentiles, three books called the *Pædagogus*, eight books of *Stromata*, and a treatise entitled, 'What rich man can be saved?' Eusebius and Jerome mention some others which are now lost.

TERTULLIAN. Quintus Septimius Florens Tertullianus, was a native of Carthage, and son of a centurion serving under the proconsul of Africa. He was at first a heathen, but the period of his conversion to Christianity is not known. He was afterwards ordained a presbyter, as would seem about A. D. 192. Jerome relates that he was said to have lived to an extreme old age. Some time before his death, he unhappily fell into the heresy of Montanus, who fancied himself to be the Paraclete. The writings of Tertullian are very numerous, and some of them were composed after he became a Montanist, but the opinions of that sect do not seem to affect the fundamental doctrines of Christianity.

MINUCIUS FELIX flourished at the beginning of the third century; Jerome places him after Tertullian, but the precise time in which he lived is not known. He was a lawyer of distinction at Rome, and became a convert to Christianity. We have remaining a Dialogue of his, entitled *Octavius*, in which Cæcilius Natalis, a heathen, and Octavius Januarius, a Christian, discuss the truth of the Christian religion; Minucius sits as judge, and it ends in the conviction of Cæcilius.

HIPPOLYTUS was certainly a bishop, but of what see cannot be clearly ascertained; he is called *Portuensis*, and is therefore supposed to have been bishop either of *Portus Romanus*, now called *Aden* in Arabia, or of *Portus* near the mouth of the Tiber; the former seems most probable, for Jerome in his Catalogue, says that he was a bishop, though he does not know of what city; and in another place he says that Origen was his pupil. He is universally said to have suffered martyrdom, though neither is the period of his death certainly known; it is supposed to have been either in the persecution under Maximus, A. D. 235, or in the Decian persecution in 250. His writings were nume-

rous, but we have only left some short treatises, and valuable fragments preserved in other writers.

ORIGEN, called Adamantius, was born at Alexandria in Egypt, about the year 185 : his father Leonides was a Christian, and suffered martyrdom before his son had reached his seventeenth year. Origen was a scholar of Clemens Alexandrinus, and a hearer of Hippolytus : when Clemens in the persecution at Alexandria under Severus fled, Origen, though only eighteen years of age, was chosen to preside in the Catechetical school. In the year 228 he was ordained to the priesthood. Having gone through many sufferings from enemies within and without the Church, he died at Tyre, A. D. 255. He was the most extensive writer in the Church of those times, not many of his works have come down to us in their original language ; we have some translated into Latin by Rufinus, but the accuracy of his translation is not to be depended on ; others were translated by Jerome, and as is generally acknowledged, faithfully.

CYPRIAN, by birth an African, and of heathen parents, was converted to Christianity A. D. 246, in the following year he was ordained a presbyter, and in 248, so great was his reputation, he was chosen and ordained bishop of Carthage. In the Decian persecution, A. D. 249, he retired from Carthage, but suffered martyrdom in 258. His remains are of the highest interest and value, especially on matters of Church discipline ; they consist of letters chiefly addressed to bishops and ministers of the Church, and of some short treatises on various subjects.

NOVATIAN, was a presbyter of the Church of Rome, in the middle of the third century. On the occasion of Cornelius being chosen to succeed Fabianus as bishop of Rome, A. D. 250, he, partly being moved by ambition, and partly differing with Cornelius on some points of discipline, brought some charges against the new bishop, and being excommunicated by a council held at Rome, procured himself to be elected, and by three country bishops ordained, to that see, in opposition to Cornelius. Hence he became a leader of a schism, and gave a name to the sect called

Novatians, which continued till the fifth century. His orthodoxy however was never questioned. The treatise concerning the Trinity, which on the authority of Jerome is now attributed to Novatian, was for some time given to Tertullian, and printed at the end of his works.

DIONYSIUS ALEXANDRINUS, a native of Alexandria, and a convert from heathenism to Christianity, succeeded Heraclas, the friend and successor of Origen, in the presidency of the Catechetical school at Alexandria, about A. D. 232, and in the see of Alexandria in 248. Some time afterwards, in his anxiety to confute the heresy of Sabellius, he exposed himself to the charge of Arianism; but amply cleared himself in a work consisting of four books, entitled his 'Refutation and Defence.' The work is now lost, with the exception of a few fragments, which are preserved in a work by Athanasius, written for the purpose of shewing that Dionysius was not an Arian. He subsequently wrote against the heresy of Paul of Samosata, but neither are these or any others of his works, (the catalogue of which is given by Jerome,) now extant, except some fragments to be found in Eusebius and Athanasius.

DIONYSIUS ROMANUS: little is known of this Father, except that he was bishop of Rome from the year 259 to 269. He wrote to his namesake of Alexandria on the subject of the Sabellian heresy, and on the charge of Arianism brought against the latter; the fragments that now remain of his writings are collected from Athanasius in Dr. Routh's *Reliquiæ Sacræ*, tom. iii.

METHODIUS, also called Eubulius, was bishop of Olympus in Syria, and afterwards of Tyre in Palestine, and suffered martyrdom at Chalcis about A. D. 311. The only entire work of his which has reached our times is *The Banquet of Ten Virgins.* Jerome mentions several other writings of his, but only a few fragments are now remaining.

ARNOBIUS. The precise period when this writer flourished is not known: he tells us however in his work *'Against the*

Gentiles,' that it was about 300 years since the Christians began to appear in the world. He was at first a heathen, and a professor of rhetoric at Sicca, a city of Numidia, in Africa.

LACTANTIUS. Lucius Cœlius (or Cœcilius) Firmianus Lactantius, was a pupil of Arnobius, and afterwards himself a teacher of rhetoric. In addition to his seven books of 'Divine Institutions,' several others are, though questionably, attributed to him. I have only quoted the above mentioned.

FOURTH CENTURY.

EUSEBIUS, surnamed Pamphilus, was ordained bishop of Cæsarea in Palestine about the year 314. He was much engaged in the Arian controversy; and though he agreed in the condemnation of Arius, yet he was afterwards an active opponent of Athanasius, and himself became one of the first propagators of the Semi-Arian heresy. For this reason I have only used him in this work as an historian, and not supported any doctrine from his writings. He died about the year 338.

ATHANASIUS, was born at Alexandria in Egypt, and when he was about twenty-seven years of age attended his diocesan Alexander to the council of Nice, being then a deacon. From that time to his death (having in the following year succeeded Alexander in the see of Alexandria) he was the great champion of the Catholic cause, throughout the relentless persecutions of the Arian party. At length he died peaceably A. D. 373, leaving behind him a name not surpassed by any of those, who suffered that martyrdom, which he was so ready to have undergone. His works are too numerous to be further noticed in this place.

HILARY, a native of Poitiers in Gaul, was afterwards bishop of that city. Little is known of his early life, except that he was a convert from heathenism. He was banished from his see by Constantius, for having espoused the Catholic cause against the Arians; but no bishop being appointed to succeed him, he con-

tinued to govern his Church in his exile. He died about the year 367.

CYRIL, of Jerusalem, succeeded Maximus as bishop of Jerusalem. He unfortunately connected himself with the Semi-Arian party, but in his Catechetical discourses, his creed seems perfectly orthodox; and he has left no other work to shew any change of opinion. Jerome tells us these discourses were composed in his youth. He died A. D. 386.

BASIL, was born of Christian parents, at Cæsarea in Cappadocia, about the year 328. He was ordained to the priesthood by Eusebius, bishop of that see, whom he succeeded about A. D. 369. He must not be confounded with his Semi-Arian namesake of Ancyra. Our Basil died in the year 379.

GREGORY NAZIANZENⁱ, was born at Arianzum, a small village near Nazianzus. His father, also called Gregory, was a convert from heathenism, and baptized about the year 325, and shortly afterwards ordained bishop of Nazianzus. There is much doubt as to the time his son Gregory was born^k. The latter was ordained a priest by his father, whom in his old age he assisted in the government of his Church. Our Gregory afterwards was made bishop of Constantinople, but being deposed by a faction retired to Nazianzus, where he died, A. D. 389.

AMBROSE, was the son of Symmachus, prætorian præfect of Gaul, he is supposed to have been born about the year 340. Ambrose, himself, was afterwards governor of some provinces of

ⁱ I have passed over Gregory Nyssen, who would follow this his namesake. The greater part of this work was compiled in Warwickshire, at a distance from any public library, and not being able to meet with a copy of the works of Gregory Nyssen, I thought it better to omit them than to be altogether indebted to the researches of others.

^k In Wall, on Infant Baptism, the doubts are stated, but not cleared up; the point is only important as shewing whether in those times a bishop would refrain from baptizing his child in infancy; if he was born some years before his father's conversion, the objection vanishes.

Gallia Cisalpina under the emperor Valentinian : while he was holding that office Auxentius, bishop of Milan, died, and there happening a great disturbance in the church between the Arian and orthodox parties, as to the choice of a new bishop, Ambrose entered the church to quell the tumult, and addressed the assembled people with so much effect, that they with one accord declared that he should be their bishop. The neighbouring bishops agreeing in the people's choice, and the emperor giving his consent, Ambrose, with much reluctance, accepted the honour conferred upon him. But, which is the most extraordinary part of the story, he had not yet been baptized, and was therefore baptized by Simplicianus, and within eight days was ordained bishop, A. D. 374. He died in 396.

EPIPHANIUS, was born at a village in Palestine, near the city of Eleutheropolis, about the year 332. He seems to have been of Christian parentage, for he was educated amongst some monks of Palestine. In 366 he was ordained bishop of Salamis, in the isle of Cyprus, and died about the year 402.

CHRYSOSTOM. Some difference of opinion has been entertained as to whether the parents of Chrysostom were Christians or heathens. Their names were Secundus and Anthusa. I have no doubt that they were both heathens, and that his father died an heathen, his death having occurred when this his second child, and only son, was very young. He was born about the year 347, and was brought up by his mother, for whose tenderness and care he seems ever to have retained a most affectionate remembrance. In early youth he was a hearer of Libanius, a celebrated heathen master of rhetoric, and a keen opposer of the Christian religion. Though this is not the only proof of his being born of heathen parents, yet it is highly improbable that a Christian mother should send her only son to such a master ; and Sozomen^b tells us, that when some of the friends of Libanius asked him who he thought fit to be his successor, he answered, " John, (meaning our author,) had not the Christians robbed us

^b Hist. l. viii. c. 2.

of him." When about eighteen years old Chrysostom became a Catechumen, and after three years was baptized by Miletius, bishop of Antioch. Miletius made him a reader in the Church, and about the year 380, ordained him a deacon, he having with difficulty been persuaded by his friends to take upon himself any sacred office. Flavianus, who succeeded Miletius in the see of Antioch, ordained him to the priesthood, and in that Church he delivered some of the most powerful of his Homilies. In 398 he was chosen and ordained to succeed Nectarius as archbishop of Constantinople. The last three years of his life were spent in banishment, and he died at the age of sixty at Pityus, a town on the Euxine sea, whither the malicious influence of his enemies had persuaded the emperor Arcadius to remove him.

JEROME, was born at Strigonium, on the borders of Pannonia and Dalmatia, about the year 340. He completed his education at Rome under Donatus; and afterwards went into the East, designing to spend his life in retirement and study; but about the year 375 was ordained priest at Antioch by Paulinus. He does not seem to have ever been actively engaged in the duties of his sacred office; but persevered in his former resolution to devote his time to sacred literature; and accordingly he became the most distinguished man in his time for learning, and a knowledge of the Scriptures. He died about A. D. 420.

AUGUSTINE, was born at Tagasta, a city of Numidia, A. D. 354. His mother Monica took care that he should be early instructed in the Christian religion, but in his youth he unfortunately suffered himself to be led away by the Manichean heretics. He afterwards went to Milan to be rhetoric professor, and there Ambrose became the instrument of his conversion to the Catholic faith. Augustine returned to Africa in 388, and was ordained a presbyter by Valerius, bishop of Hippo, in 391. Valerius, seeing the estimation in which he was universally held, and fearing to lose him out of his diocese, procured him to be ordained his coadjutor in the see of Hippo: this act was in direct contravention of a canon of the council of Nice, but Augustine was not at the time aware of its being so. He died in the year of our Lord 430, being then seventy-six years of age.

Such is the list of the Fathers, whom I have quoted as authorities in this volume ; some few others, but not prior to the end of the fourth century, are occasionally cited, amongst them are the historians Socrates and Theodoret, who relate matters that occurred within the period to which I have limited my researches.

WHITE WALTHAM,

June 6th, 1835.



THE THIRTY-NINE ARTICLES

ILLUSTRATED

FROM THE

WRITINGS OF THE FATHERS.

ARTICLE I.

Of Faith in the Holy Trinity.

“THERE is but one living and true God, everlasting,
“without body, parts, or passions, of infinite power,
“wisdom, and goodness, the maker and preserver of all
“things both visible and invisible; and in the unity of
“this Godhead there be three persons of one substance,
“power, and eternity, the Father, the Son, and the
“Holy Ghost.”

This Article begins with that which is the foundation of all religion, the Being and Attributes of God; but its more important object, as the primary article of a Christian's faith, is the assertion of the doctrine of the Holy Trinity.

It seems scarcely necessary in the present work to adduce any passages from the Fathers, in which they proved the Being of God from mere reason.

Discussions of natural religion do not properly belong to articles of faith extracted and deduced from Scripture. It will be of use, however, to shew their belief, that there is but One God, and also their conception of the attributes of God; as by the former their assertions as to the Trinity in Unity will be confirmed and explained, and by the latter their notion of the word "God."

First, then, the article asserts, that "*there is but one living and true God.*"

We may begin with a passage from the "Shepherd of Hermas :"—

"First of all believe that there is one God, who created and established all things, and made all things out of nothing to have being. He comprehends all things, and is only immense. Who can neither be defined by any words, nor conceived by the mind. Therefore believe in him, and fear him; and, fearing him, abstain from all evil. Keep these things, and cast all things far from thee; and put on the virtue of righteousness, and thou shalt live to God, if thou shalt keep this commandment^a."

The following passages from Athenagoras, Tertullian, and Cyprian, are all equally express.

"But our discourse declares that there is one God, the maker of the universe, who himself not being made, (for that which is, is not made, but

^a HERMÆ *Pastor*, l. ii.
Mand. i. Primum omnium,
credere quòd unus est Deus,
qui omnia creavit, et consum-

mavit, et ex nihilo omnia fecit.
Ipse capax universorum, solus
immensus est.

that which is not,) created all things by his Word^b.”

The following quotations from Tertullian are important, not only as shewing that the Fathers believed in one God, but also that they did not apply the term God in any other than its one intention; and therefore, whenever they call Christ or the Holy Ghost “God,” they attribute to them divinity in its highest sense.

“God is the name of the very substance, that is, of divinity: but Lord is not the name of the substance, but shews that the substance of power always existed together with his own name, which is God, and afterwards Lord^c.”

“But the Christian truth expressly declares; God, if he be not one, is none; for whatsoever is not as it ought to be, we believe it more fitting that it be not at all. But that you may know that God should be but one, enquire what God is, and you will find that it cannot be otherwise. As far as the human capacity can define any thing of God, I define that, which every man’s conscience also acknowledges, that God is the highest and chief Being, existing in eternity, unborn, unmade, without beginning, without end^d.”

^b ATHENAG. *Leg. pro Christ.*
c. 4. Ἐπεὶ δὲ ὁ λόγος ἡμῶν ἑνα
θεὸν ἄγει, τὸν τοῦδε τοῦ παντὸς
ποιητὴν, κ. τ. λ.

^c TERTULL. *adv. Hermog.*
c. 3. Deus substantiæ ipsius
nomen, id est, divinitatis; Do-
minus vero non substantiæ, sed
potestatis substantiam semper

fuisse cum suo nomine, quod
est Deus, postea Dominus.

^d Idem *adv. Marcion*, l. i. c.
3. Sed veritas Christiana de-
strictè pronunciavit, Deus, si
non unus est, non est—Deum
autem ut scias unum esse de-
bere, quære quid sit Deus, et
non aliter invenies—.

And a little after, “ Therefore he must needs be one only, because he is the chiefest, not having an equal, lest he should not be the chiefest ^e.”

“ I am commanded not to call any one else God; not to make any other God even in speech; not by my tongue any more than by my hand; not to worship any other, or pay any kind of homage, except to that only God, who thus commands ^f.”

“ Therefore there is one God, Lord of all; for his sublime greatness cannot admit an equal, seeing himself alone possesseth all power ^g.” And shortly afterwards, “ Neither do thou wonder at this so much concerning man, since in this all nature agrees. The bees have one king, the flocks one leader, and the herds one captain; much more hath the world one Governor, who by his Word commandeth all things whatsoever; by his Wisdom dispenseth, by his power perfecteth. He cannot be seen, he is more clear than sight; nor comprehended, he is more pure than touch; nor valued, he is beyond calculation; and therefore we so worthily esteem of God, when we say he is inestimable ^h.”

^e TERTULL. *adv. Marcion*, l. i. c. 3. Ergo unicum sit necesse est, quod fuerit summum magnum; par non habendo, ne non sit summum magnum.

^f Idem *Scorp.* c. 4. Præscribitur mihi, ne quem alium Deum dicam, ne vel dicendo non minus linguâ quam manu Deum fingam, neque alium adorem, aut quomodo venerer, præter unicum illum, qui ita mandat.

^g CYPRIANI *de Idolorum Vanitate*, c. 5. Unus igitur omnium Dominus est Deus; neque enim illa sublimitas potest habere consortem, cum sola omnem teneat potestatem.

^h Idem, *ibid.* Multò magis mundi unus est rector, qui universa quæcunque sunt, verbo jubet, ratione dispensat, virtute consummat.

Secondly, “*Everlasting.*”

“There is no time in eternity; for it is itself all time. That which is the cause of all being, cannot itself be caused: that never grows old, which cannot be born. God, if he is old, will some time or other not be; if young, there must have been a time when he was not. Newness testifies a beginning; age threatens an end. But God is as much a stranger to beginning and ending, as to time, the arbiter and measurer of beginning and endingⁱ.”

“Dost thou believe that the supreme power in heaven is divided? that the whole power of that true and divine government is cleft? when it is manifest that God, the Parent of all things, has neither beginning nor ending; who bestows nativity on all things, perpetuity upon himself; who, before the world was, was a world unto himself^k.”

Thirdly, “*Without body, parts, or passions.*”

Thus Athenagoras, shewing that the idols of the heathens were not Gods, says, “But if they should say that they are constituted only of flesh, and have blood, and seed, and are subject to the passions of anger and desire; then also we must account such words as trifles, and ridiculous; for

ⁱ TERTULL. *adv. Marcion*, l. i. c. 8. Deus autem tam alienus ab initio et fine est, quam a tempore, arbitro et metatore initii et finis.

^k MINUT. *Fel. Octav.* p. 18. —Cum palam sit parentem omnium Deum, nec principium habere nec terminum.—

there is neither anger, nor lust, nor desire, nor prolific seed in God¹."

So Theophylus, Novatian, and Origen; "The form or shape of God is ineffable and inexpressible, and cannot be seen with bodily eyes. For he is infinite in glory, incomprehensible in greatness, inconceivable in height, superexcellent in power, incomparable in wisdom, inimitable in goodness, unspeakable in beneficence^m."

"For that (divine) substance is simple, and neither compounded of any members, nor joints, or affections; but whatsoever is done by the divine power, that men might understand it, is either expressed by the appellation of human members, or declared by common and known affections. And in this manner God is said either to be angry, or to hear, or to speakⁿ."

"Neither are members, or the offices of members needful to God, to whose very silent will all things are subservient and present. For why should he require eyes, who is light itself? or why should he desire feet, who is every where? or why should he wish to go in any where, seeing there is no where that he can go out of himself? or why should he be in need of hands, whose very silent will is able to effect all things? Neither does he

¹ ATHENAG. *Leg. pro Christianis*, c. 21. — Οὐτε γὰρ ὄργη, οὐτε ἐπιθυμία καὶ ὄρεξις, οὐδὲ παιδοποιὸν σπέρμα ἐν τῷ θεῷ.

^m THEOPHYL. *ad Autolyicum*. l. i. c. 3. Τὸ μὲν, εἶδος, τοῦ Θεοῦ, ἀβήρητον καὶ ἀνέκφραστον, καὶ μὴ δυνάμενον ὀφθαλμοῖς

σαρκίοις ὁραθῆναι· δόξα γὰρ ἐστὶν ἀχώρητος, κ. τ. λ.

ⁿ ORIGEN. *in Genes. Hom.* iii. s. 2. Simplex namque est illa substantia, et neque membris ullis, neque compaginibus, affectibusque composita.

want ears, who knoweth the very silent motions of the heart °.”

Fourthly, “*Of infinite power, wisdom, and goodness.*”

“God being perfectly good, is eternally doing good^p.”

Tertullian calls God goodness itself. “Goodness said, ‘Let us make man in our image, after our likeness^q ;’ Goodness formed man of the dust of the earth^r.”

“They do not know God aright, who do not think that he can do what they do not think^s.”

“Nothing is difficult to God. Who is ignorant of this? And who knows not ‘that things that are impossible with beings of this world, are possible with God^t?’ And ‘God hath chosen the foolish things of this world to confound the wise^u; all these things do we read^x.” And shortly afterwards,

“Of a truth nothing is difficult to God. But if in our presumptions we use this assertion so abruptly, we may feign any thing of God, as if he hath done it, because he can do it. But because

° NOVAT. *de Trinitate*. c. 6. Neque sunt ei aut membra, aut membrorum officia necessaria, ad cujus solum etiam tacitum arbitrium et serviunt et adsunt omnia.

^p ATHENAG. *Leg. pro Christianis*, c. 26. ‘Ο δὲ Θεὸς τελείως ἀγαθὸς ὢν, ἀνδρώως ἀγαθοποιός ἐστιν,

^q Gen. i. 26.

^r TERTULL. *adv. Marcion*, l. ii. c. 4. Faciamus hominem ad

imaginem et similitudinem nostram, bonitas dixit; bonitas finxit hominem delimo.

^s TERTULL. *de Resur. Carnis*, c. 38. Male Deum norunt, qui non putant illum posse, quod non putant.

^t Matt. xix. 26.

^u 1 Cor. i. 27.

^x TERTULL. *adv. Prax.* c. 10. Sed nihil Deo difficile. Quis hoc nesciat?—

he can do all things, we are not therefore to believe that he has done that also which he has not done. But we must enquire whether he has done it^y.”

“According to us God is able to do all things, the ability to do which is not inconsistent with his being God, and his being good, and his being wise^z.”

Fifthly, “*The Maker and Preserver of all things.*”

“Having, therefore, this hope, let our souls be bound to him, who is faithful in his promises, and righteous in his judgments; who having commanded us not to lie, much more will not himself lie. For nothing is impossible with God, but to lie. Let his faith, then, be stirred up in us; and let us consider that all things are nigh unto him. By the word of his power he made all things, and by the same word he is able to destroy them. ‘Who shall say unto him, what dost thou? or who shall resist the power of his strength^a?’ When, and as he pleased, he made all things; and nothing shall pass away of all that has been determined by him. All things are open before him; and nothing is hid from his counsel. ‘The heavens declare the glory of the Lord, and the firmament sheweth his handy work. Day unto day uttereth speech, and night unto night sheweth knowledge. There is no

^y Idem ibid. Plane nihil Deo difficile.—

^z ORIG. c. *Cels.* l. iii. c. 70.
Δύναται δέ καθ’ ἡμᾶς πάντα ὁ Θεός,

ἅπερ δυνάμενος, τοῦ Θεοῦ εἶναι, καὶ τοῦ ἀγαθοῦ εἶναι, καὶ σοφοῦ εἶναι, οὐκ ἐξίσταται.

^a Wisdom, xii. 12.

speech nor language, where their voice is not heard ^{b, c}

Irenæus says, “ The rule of truth is, that there is one God Almighty, who created all things by his word, and fitted them, and made them of that which was not, so that all things should be as the Scripture says; ‘ By the word of the Lord were the heavens made, and all the host of them by the breath of his mouth ^d.’ And again, ‘ All things were made by him, and without him was not any thing made that was made ^e.’ But from all things nothing is excluded; but the Father by himself made all things, whether visible or invisible, whether endowed with feeling or with understanding; whether temporal, for some purpose of his, or eternal ^f. ”

And in another place, having observed on the absurd opinions of those who entertained very false notions of God, he says, “ There is only one God, the maker of all things, who is over every principality, and power, and denomination, and virtue; he is the Father, he is God, he is the Creator, he is the Maker, he is the Worker, who made those things by himself; that is, by his Word

^b Psalm xix. 1.

^c CLEM. ROM. *Ep. ad Corinth.* s. 27. — Ἐν λόγῳ τῆς μεγαλωσύνης αὐτοῦ συνεστήσατο τὰ πάντα, καὶ ἐν λόγῳ δύναται αὐτὰ καταστρέψαι —

^d Psalm xxxiii. 6.

^e John, i. 3.

^f IRENÆI l. i. c. 22. s. 1. — quia sit unus Deus omnipo-

tens, qui omnia condidit per Verbum suum, et aptavit, et fecit ex eo quod non erat.—Ex omnibus autem nihil subtrac- tum est; sed omnia per ipsum fecit Pater, sive visibilia, sive invisibilia, sive sensibilia, sive intelligibilia, sive temporalia propter quandam dispositionem, sive sempiterna.

and by his Wisdom, the heaven and the earth, and the sea, and all things that are therein : he is just, he is good ; he it is who formed man, who planted paradise, who made the world, who brought the deluge, who saved Noah ; he is the God of Abraham, and the God of Isaac, and the God of Jacob, the God of the living, whom also the law declares, whom the Prophets preach, whom Christ reveals, whom the Apostles deliver, whom the Church believes ^g.”

“ It behoves those who believe God to be the Creator of the universe, to attribute to his wisdom and justice the custody and providence over all things that are made ; if at least they will abide by their own principles ; and thinking thus of these things, they must be persuaded, that there is nothing of things in earth, nor of things in heaven, destitute of his care and providence ; but must know, that the care of their Creator is over every thing, the invisible alike and the visible, little and great : for all things that are, have need of the care of their Creator, and every one individually according to its own nature, and the end for which it was created ^h.”

^g IRENÆI l. ii. c. 30. s. ult. Solus unus Deus fabricator, hic est, qui super omnem principitatem, et potestatem, et dominationem, et virtutem : hic Pater, hic Deus, hic conditor, hic factor, hic fabricator, qui fecit ea per semetipsum, hoc est, per Verbum et per Sapientiam suam, cœlum et

terram, et mare, et omnia quæ in eis sunt.

^h ATHENAG. *de Resur. Mort.* c. 18. Δεῖ τοὺς ποιητὴν τὸν Θεὸν τοῦδε τοῦ παντὸς παραδεξάμενους, τῇ τούτου σοφίᾳ καὶ δικαιοσύνῃ τὴν τῶν γενομένων ἀπάντων ἀνατιθέναι φυλακὴν τε καὶ πρόνοιαν^κ κ. τ. λ.

“The doctrine that is according to Christ, both acknowledgeth the Creator, and that Providence reacheth even unto particular thingsⁱ.”

“The object of our worship is one God, who, to the glory of his majesty, brought forth out of nothing, the whole frame of this universe, furnished with all the elements, and bodies, and spirits, by his Word by which he commanded; by his Wisdom by which he disposed it; by his Power by which he was able to do it; whence also the Greeks denominated the world by a word, which implies order and beauty^k. God is invisible, although plainly seen; incomprehensible by touch, although represented to us by his gracious revelation; inappreciable, although our senses bear testimony to his existence. Hence he is the true God, since he is immensely great. But that which can be seen by the ordinary senses, or touched or defined, is less than the eyes by which it is discerned, and the hands by the contact of which it is defiled, and the senses by which it is discovered. But that which is immense in known to itself alone. This it is which causes God to become intelligible, although he cannot be fully understood. The immensity of his being presents him to our minds, as at once known and unknown^l,”

ⁱ CLEM. ALEX. *Strom.* l.i. c.

11. Ἡ γὰρ ἀκόλουθος Χριστῷ διδασκαλία, καὶ τὸν δημιουργὸν ἐκθειάζει, καὶ τὴν πρόνοιαν μέχρι τῶν κατὰ μέρος ἄγει.

^k κόσμος,

^l TERTULL. *Apol.* c. 17.

Quod colimus, Deus unus est; qui totam molem istam cum omni instrumento elementorum, corporum, spirituum, verbo, quo jussit, ratione, quâ disposuit, virtute, quâ potuit, de nihilo expressit.

“The rule of truth requires, that first of all we believe in God the Father and Lord Almighty, that is, the most perfect Creator of all things, who hanged the heavens on high, founded the earth below, diffused the seas, and adorned and replenished all these things with their proper and condign instruments ^m.”

“Is there any religion more true, more availing, more powerful, more just, than to know God to be the chief, and to know to supplicate God the chief, who alone is the head and fountain of all good things, alike the Founder and Creator of perpetual things, by whom all terrestrial and all celestial things are animated, and irrigated by vital motion; and who if he was not, there could be nothing truly, that could bear any name or substance ⁿ ?”

Lastly, “*In Unity of this Godhead there be three persons, of one substance, power, and eternity.*”

In coming to the last thing which this Article asserts, it will be necessary to say a few words on the two great heresies that arose in the third and fourth centuries, and which are here, by implication, declared to be false and unscriptural.

^m NOVAT. *de Trinit. Init.* Regula exigit veritatis, ut primo omnium credamus in Deum Patrem et dominum omnipotentem, id est, rerum omnium perfectissimum Conditorem, qui cœlum altâ sublimitate suspenderit, terram dejectâ mole solidaverit, maria soluto liquore diffuderit, et hæc omnia pro-

priis et condignis instrumentis et ornata et plena digesserit.

ⁿ ARNOB. *c. Gentes*, l. ii. p. init. Qui bonorum omnium solus caput et fons est, perpetuarum pariter Fundator et Conditore rerum, à quo omnia terrena cunctaque cœlestia animantur, motu irriganturque vitali.

Sabellius, a Bishop or Presbyter in Pentapolis, a district of Cyrenaica, about the middle of the third century, broached a doctrine which was somewhat similar to, though not precisely the same as, that which his master Noetus, had held immediately before him. Noetus had maintained the unity of God, in one person, under three names or offices, and hence was accused of being a Patripassian. Sabellius, his disciple, not choosing to admit that the Deity had suffered, maintained that a certain emanation or energy, proceeding from the Godhead, and which he called the Son of God, was united to the man Jesus: so he considered the Holy Ghost to be an emanation from the Supreme and Everlasting Father: thereby altogether denying the distinction of persons in the Divine Nature. His tenets in a short time spread very widely in the Eastern Church, and made some way in the Western; but were immediately condemned, and repudiated by those who then, and through all subsequent ages, have been deemed the orthodox believers.

The Arian Heresy first came to light in opposition to the Sabellian. Alexander had been advanced to the primacy of the Egyptian Church, to which Arius had at the same time aspired; and in a public meeting of the clergy of Alexandria had been insisting on the orthodox doctrine, maintaining "that the Son of God was co-eternal, co-essential, and co-equal with the Father." Arius who was then one of the public preachers of Alexandria, and, as some suppose, master of the Catechetical School, immediately accused his diocesan of Sabel-

lianism, arguing that his doctrine was inconsistent and impossible, since the Father who begat, must of necessity be before the Son who was begotten, and that consequently the latter could not be absolutely eternal. That Alexander was not a Sabellian will be seen by the extracts from his "Defence," given in their proper place.

More need not now be said of these two heresies, but it must be borne in mind in reading the following extracts that the Sabellians denied the distinction of persons in the Godhead; the Arians the co-eternity and co-equality of the Father and the Son.

I shall have occasion under the following and the fifth Articles to make mention of other sects that have denied the doctrine of the Trinity, and therefore need now allude only to the two chief heresies that were promulgated prior to the Council of Nice, in the year 325.

Ignatius, exhorting the Magnesians to unity, says, "As the Lord did nothing, either by himself or the Apostles, without the Father, being united with him, so neither do ye any thing without the bishop and elders^o." Much stress, perhaps, cannot be laid on this passage as proving Ignatius's belief in the unity of the Father and the Son; but it is noted in this place as introductory to an expression used by the same author at the conclusion of the same chapter "All of you therefore come together

^o IGNAT. *ad Magnes*, s. 7.
 Ὡςπερ οὖν ὁ Κύριος ἄνευ τοῦ Πα-
 τρός οὐδὲν ἐποίησε, ἡνωμένος αὐν, οὕτε

δι' αὐτοῦ, οὔτε διὰ τῶν ἀποστόλων.
 κ. τ. λ.,

to one temple of God, to one altar, to one Jesus Christ, who proceeded from one Father, and in that one exists and is contained^p." Words can hardly express the doctrine of our Church more distinctly than these do, but they fall far short of the original in expressing that oneness of Being, and mutual indwelling which our author seems to have intended.

Immediately after the martyrdom of Polycarp the church of Smyrna wrote a circular Epistle to the other churches giving a most interesting account of his last moments. The concluding words of the prayer offered up by this holy man when fastened to the stake, and immediately before his death, and which is preserved in the above-mentioned Epistle, are applicable to the point now under consideration. The whole prayer however is given, on account of its extreme beauty and the strain of heavenly piety that breathes throughout.

"O Lord God Almighty, the Father of thy well-beloved and blessed Son Jesus Christ, by whom we have received knowledge of thee, the God of Angels and Powers, and of every creature; and of the whole race of just men who live in thy sight. I give thee hearty thanks, that thou hast vouchsafed to bring me to this day, and to this hour; that I should have a part in the number of thy martyrs, in the cross of thy Christ, to the resurrection of eternal life, both of soul and body in

^p IGNAT. *ad Magnes*, s. 7.
 Πάντες οἷον ὡς εἰς ἓνα ναὸν συντρέχ-
 ετε Θεοῦ, ὡς ἐπὶ ἓν θυσιαστήριον,

ὡς ἐπὶ ἓνα Ἰησοῦν Χριστὸν τὸν ἀπ' ἑνὸς Πατρὸς προελθόντα, καὶ εἰς ἓνα ὄντα καὶ χωρήσαντα.

the incorruption of the Holy Ghost, Among which may I be accepted this day before thee as a fat and acceptable sacrifice ; as thou the true God, with whom is no falsehood, hast both before ordained and manifested unto me, and also hast now fulfilled it. Wherefore even for all things else I praise thee, I bless thee, I glorify thee, together with the eternal and heavenly Jesus Christ, thy beloved Son, with whom, to thee, and the Holy Ghost, be glory, both now and for evermore. Amen^q."

If these are the words of Polycarp there cannot be a doubt that he ascribed equal glory to all the three persons of the Godhead : but it must not be concealed that Eusebius has given a different version of the conclusion of this prayer : "I glorify thee through the eternal High Priest Jesus Christ thy beloved Son ; through whom be glory to thee together with him in the Holy Ghost, both now and for evermore. Amen^r."

This form of doxology has been made use of by Arian writers in support of their peculiar tenets, on the ground that equal glory is not ascribed to all the three persons, but that the Father is placed above the two others. Without reference to the discussions that *afterwards* arose out of the various

^q *Epist. Eccl. Smyrn. de Martyrio Polycarpi*, s. 14. Διὰ τοῦτο καὶ περὶ πάντων αἰνῶ σε, εὐλογῶ σε, δοξάζω σε, σὺν τῷ αἰωνίῳ καὶ ἐπουρανίῳ Ἰησοῦ Χριστῷ, ἀγαπητῷ σου παιδί, μεθ' οὗ σοὶ καὶ Πνεύματι Ἁγίῳ ἡ δόξα, καὶ νῦν καὶ εἰς τοὺς μέλλοντας αἰῶνας. Ἀμήν.

^r EUSEB. *Hist.* l. iv. c. 15. p. 169. Διὰ τοῦ αἰωνίου ἀρχιερέως Ἰησοῦ Χριστοῦ τοῦ ἀγαπητοῦ σου παιδός· δι' οὗ σοὶ σὺν αὐτῷ ἐν Πνεύματι Ἁγίῳ δόξα, καὶ νῦν καὶ εἰς τοὺς μέλλοντας αἰῶνας.

forms of the doxologies, it may be remarked that if the above from Eusebius be taken as the original and orthodox form, it does not give the least support to Arianism.—For the words, “be glory to thee (the Father) together with him” (the Son,) surely attribute the same glory to the Son that is attributed to the Father; nor will the circumstance, that the words “through whom” are prefixed, help the opposite argument; for we are directed to approach^s the Father through the Son, so that the expression “through whom” asserts the distinction of the persons, and the glory given “to the Father, together with the Son,” asserts their equality.

It is foreign to the purpose of this work to enter into the disputes concerning the form of doxology: the reader, therefore, who shall not be satisfied with the use made of the passages here translated, is requested to consult Bp. Bull^t, and Dr. Burton’s unanswerable “Testimonies to the Doctrine of the Trinity^u.”

The letter of the church of Smyrna, in which the above prayer is contained, concludes with an expression which, if it be not admitted as an argument against the correctness of the version of Eusebius, is at all events an independent authority in support of the doctrine of the Trinity:

“We wish you all happiness, brethren, by living according to the rule of the gospel of Jesus Christ,

^s John, xiv. 6.

^t Def. Fid. Nic.

^u Pp. 6—13.

with whom be glory to God the Father and the Holy Ghost, for the salvation of his chosen saints^x.”

This passage is not quoted by Eusebius, but is added by Valesius in his notes, (p. 171.) with a slight variation in the reading: “We wish you health, brethren, while you walk according to the gospel of Jesus Christ, with whom be glory to God the Father and the Holy Ghost^y.”

The account of the martyrdom of Ignatius, to the same purpose, says that he lived and died, “By the grace and loving-kindness of our Lord Jesus Christ, with whom be glory to the Father and the Holy and life-giving Spirit, now and always, and for ever and ever. Amen^z.”

Justin, having answered the charge of atheism that was brought against the Christians, and having shewn that God requires his creatures to worship him in spirit and in faith, and not by sacrifices and incense, proceeds: “We have learned that he who taught us these things, and for this end was born, Jesus Christ, who was crucified under Pontius Pilate, the procurator of Judæa in the time of Tiberius Cæsar, was the Son of him who is truly God, and we esteem him in the second place; and that we with reason honour the prophetic Spirit

^x *Epist. Eccl. Smyrn. de Martyrio Polycarpi*, s. 22.

— μεθ' οὗ δόξα τῷ Θεῷ καὶ Πατρὶ καὶ Ἁγίῳ Πνεύματι—

^y EUSEB. l. iv. c. 15. p. 171. n. Ἐφ' ὧσθαι ἡμᾶς ἐνχόμεθα, ἀδελφοί,

στοιχοῦντας τῷ κατὰ τὸ εὐαγγέλιον λόγῳ Ἰησοῦ Χριστοῦ μεθ' οὗ δόξα τῷ Θεῷ καὶ Πατρὶ καὶ Ἁγίῳ Πνεύματι.

^z IGNAT. *Martyr.* s. 27.

— μεθ' οὗ τῷ Πατρὶ δόξα καὶ τῷ Ἁγίῳ καὶ ἑωποῦ Πνεύματι—

in the third rank, I shall presently show^a." That Justin did not in this passage intend to express any inequality in the three persons of the Trinity, may be inferred from his calling the Son "God," in other places, and also from the consideration of the scope of his argument, which is to prove that the Christians are not atheists, for that they worship the Father, the Son, and the Holy Ghost; the mention of the two latter would have been impertinent to the occasion, had he not believed in the divinity of the Son and of the Holy Ghost.

And Athenagoras, in answer to the same charge of atheism, furnishes us with a more distinct declaration of his belief in the unity of the Godhead, and the distinction of the persons: "That we are not atheists, since we acknowledge one God, unbegotten, and eternal, and invisible, and impassible, not bounded by space, and indivisible, comprehended in mind and reason only, clothed with ineffable light and beauty, and spirit and power, by whom, through his Word, all things are made, and are kept in order and established, I have sufficiently shown. And we also acknowledge the Son of God. And let not any one think this ridiculous that God should have a Son; for we do not think of God, who is also the Father, or of the Son, as the poets fable, making Gods no better than men; but the Son of God is the Word of

^a JUSTIN. *Apol.* i. c. 13.
Τὸν διδάσκαλόν τε τούτων γεγόμενον
ἡμῖν, — Τὸν αὐτοῦ τοῦ ὄντως Θεοῦ
μαθόντες, καὶ ἐν δευτέρᾳ χάριτι

ἔχοντες· Πνεῦμά τε προφητικὸν
ἐν τρίτῃ τάξει ὅτι μετὰ λόγου τι-
μῶμεν, ἀποδείξομεν.

the Father, in idea and energy, for by him and through him all things were made, the Father and the Son being one; the Son being in the Father and the Father in the Son, in unity and power of Spirit: the Son of God is the mind and word of the Father^b."

And again, "Who would not be surprised if he heard that we are called atheists, who call the Father God, and the Son God, and the Holy Ghost, shewing, at the same time, their power in unity, and their distinction in order^c."

And in another place still more plainly:—"But we, who account this present life as worth little or nothing, and are conducted through it only by knowing God and the Word proceeding from him, *that is to say by knowing*, what is the unity of the Son with the Father, what the communion of the Father with the Son, what is the Spirit, what is the union of so many persons, and the distinction of them united, the Spirit, the Son, the Father—shall not credit be given to us for being worshippers of God^d."

^b ATHENAG. *Legat. pro Christianis*, c. 10. — "Ἐνὸς ὄντος τοῦ Πατρὸς καὶ τοῦ Υἱοῦ· ὄντος δὲ τοῦ Υἱοῦ ἐν Πατρὶ, καὶ Πατρὸς ἐν Υἱῷ, ἐνότητι καὶ δυνάμει Πνεύματος, νοῦς καὶ Λόγος τοῦ Πατρὸς, ὁ Υἱὸς τοῦ Θεοῦ."

^c Idem *ibid.* Τίς οὖν οὐκ ἂν ἀπορήσῃ, λέγοντας Θεὸν Πατέρα, καὶ Υἱὸν Θεοῦ, καὶ Πνεῦμα Ἅγιον, δεικνύντας αὐτῶν καὶ τὴν ἐν τῇ ἐνότητι δυνάμιν, καὶ τὴν ἐν τῇ τάξει

διαίρεσιν, ἀκούσας ἀθέους καλουμένους.

^d Idem, c. 12.—"Τὰ μόνου δὲ παραπεμπόμενοι τοῦ τὸν Θεὸν καὶ τὸν παρ' αὐτοῦ Λόγον εἰδέναι, τίς ἢ τοῦ Παιδὸς πρὸς τὸν Πατέρα ἐνότης, τίς ἢ τοῦ Πατρὸς πρὸς τὸν Υἱὸν κοινωνία, τί τὸ Πνεῦμα, τίς ἢ τῶν τοσούτων ἑνώσεις, καὶ διαίρεσις ἐνουμένων, τοῦ Πνεύματος, τοῦ Παιδὸς, τοῦ Πατρὸς—"

Irenæus, having, in the first chapter of his first book, given a long account of the various heresies which it was his object to expose and explode, begins his second chapter with an epitome of the Christian faith, which, it may be not unreasonable to conjecture, was taken from the creed used in his church : he says,

“The Church, although dispersed over the whole world, even to the extreme parts of the earth, has received from the Apostles and their disciples, that faith which is in one God the Father Almighty, who made heaven, and earth, and the sea, and all things that are therein; and in one Christ Jesus, the Son of God, who was incarnate for our salvation; and in the Holy Ghost, who declared by the Prophets the incarnation^e, and the coming, and the generation from the Virgin, and the suffering, and the resurrection from the dead, and the ascension in the flesh into heaven, of the beloved Christ Jesus our Lord, and his coming from heaven in the glory of the Father to sum up all things, and to raise up all the flesh of all mankind, that to Christ Jesus our Lord, and God, and Saviour, and King, according to the good pleasure of the invisible Father, ‘every knee should bow, of things in heaven, and things in earth, and things

* That *εικονομία* was constantly used in this sense by the Fathers see BULL, *Defens.* iv. 3. 12, and SUICER’s *The-saurus*. It is not necessary to enter into further explanation here, as the precise meaning of

the word is of no importance with a view to the question before us. DR. BURTON has translated it in the same way, *Test. to the Divinity of Christ*, p. 70.

under the earth; and that every tongue should confess him^f; and that he should do righteous judgment upon all: that he should send the spirits of evil, and angels that have transgressed and become apostate, and the impious, and unrighteous, and wicked, and blasphemers amongst men into everlasting fire; but to the righteous, and holy, and that have observed his commandments, and have abided in his love, some from the beginning, and some after repentance, giving life of free grace, he may grant incorruption, and clothe them with everlasting glory^g."

In the above passage Irenæus says that there is but one God, yet he calls Jesus Christ "Lord and God;" he says, also, that the Holy Ghost "declared by the Prophets," those things which the Prophets themselves prophecied by divine inspiration, and which none, whether Jews or Christians of any denomination, ever doubted were revealed to them by God. The conclusion is obvious, that if Irenæus has rightly represented this as the faith of the church dispersed over the whole world, the catholic faith then was, as it now is, that the Father is God, the Son God, and the Holy Ghost God, and yet that there is but one God. Their belief, too, in the distinction of persons must necessarily follow from the different expressions ap-

^f Philip. ii. 10, 11.

^g IRENÆI l. i. c. ii. s. 1.
Ἡ μὲν ἐκκλησία—παραλαβοῦσα
τὴν εἰς ἕνα Θεὸν Πατέρα παντοκρά-
τορα—πίστιν· καὶ εἰς ἕνα Χρισ-
τὸν Ἰησοῦν, τὸν Υἱὸν τοῦ Θεοῦ, τὸν

σαρκωθέντα ὑπὲρ τῆς ἡμετέρας
σωτηρίας· καὶ εἰς Πνεῦμα Ἅγιον, τὸ
διὰ τῶν προφητῶν κεκηρυχὸς—ἵνα
Χριστῷ Ἰησοῦ τῷ Κυρίῳ ἡμῶν, καὶ
Θεῷ, καὶ σωτῆρι, καὶ βασιλεῖ—
πάν γόνυ κάμψῃ, κ. τ. λ.

plied to the different persons ; “ The Holy Ghost declared by the Prophets” not concerning himself, but concerning Christ Jesus ; Christ Jesus is to come “ in the glory of the Father,” who is at the same time to be “ invisible.” -

After the foregoing extract the reader can hardly fail to discover a belief in the divinity of the second and third persons of the Trinity in the following passages ; “ Thus, therefore, was God manifested ; for by all these means God the Father is revealed, the Spirit operating, the Son ministering, and the Father approving, and man’s salvation being thereby completed^h.” And again, “ Man, who was created and formed, was made after the image and likeness of the uncreated God ; the Father approving and commanding ; the Son effecting and creating ; and the Holy Ghost nourishing and increasingⁱ.” And again, still more clearly, “ His Word and Wisdom, the Son and the Spirit, are always present with God, by whom and with whom he freely and spontaneously made all things, to whom also he speaks, saying, “ let us make man in our image, after our likeness^{k l}.”

That Irenæus believed in the doctrine of the

^h IRENÆI l. iv. c. 20. s. 6.
—Per omnia enim hæc Deus Pater ostenditur, Spiritu quidem operante, Filio vero ministrante, Patre vero comprobante.

ⁱ Idem. l. iv. c. 38. s. 3.
—Τοῦ μὲν Πατρὸς εὐδοκούντος, καὶ κελεύοντος, τοῦ δὲ Υἱοῦ πράσ-

σαντος καὶ δημιουργοῦντος, τοῦ δὲ Πνεύματος τρέφοντος καὶ αὐξάνοντος.

^k Gen. i. 25.

^l IRENÆI l. iv. c. 20. s. 1.
Adest enim ei semper Verbum et Sapientia, Filius et Spiritus, per quos, et in quibus omnia libere et sponte fecit, ad quos et loquitur, dicens, etc.

Trinity, is evident from his applying the words of St. Paul, in his Epistle to the Ephesians, iv. 6. to the Son and the Holy Ghost, as well as to the Father, “And thus one God the Father is revealed, who is above all, and through all, and in us all. The Father is above all things, and he is the head of Christ; but the Word is through all things, and he is the head of the Church; but the Spirit is in all of us, and he is the living water, which the Lord supplies to those that believe rightly in him, and love him, and know that ‘there is one Father, who is above all, and through all, and in us all^{m, n}.’”

Bishop Bull quotes the following passage from Clemens Alexandrinus, as “a full and perfect confession of the most holy Trinity.” Dr. Burton also justly observes that “it is the more remarkable, because there is nothing preceding, which led Clement thus to apostrophise the three persons, or to mention the third person at all.” Having had occasion to speak of our Saviour’s being born of a Virgin, he exclaims, “O mysterious wonder! The universal Father is one; the universal Word is

^m Ephes. iv. 6.

ⁿ IRENÆI, l. v. c. 18. s. 2. Et sic unus Deus Pater ostenditur, qui est super omnia, et per omnia, et in omnibus. Super omnia quidem Pater, et ipse est caput Christi: per omnia autem Verbum, et ipse est caput

Ecclesiæ; in omnibus autem nobis Spiritus, et ipse est aqua viva, quam præstat Dominus in se recte credentibus, et diligentibus se, et scientibus quia, *unus Pater, qui est super omnia, et per omnia, et in omnibus nobis.*

also one; and the Holy Spirit is one; and this same Spirit is every where °.”

And the following prayer, though perhaps difficult to be understood, clearly expresses the Unity of the three persons; “Be merciful, Instructor, to thy children, O Father, thou Director of Israel, Son and Father, both one, Lord, and grant—that giving thanks we may praise, and praising, we may give thanks to the only One, Father and Son, Son and Father, to the Son, Instructor and Teacher, together with the Holy Ghost, in all things one, in whom are all things, through whom all things are one, through whom is eternity ♀.”

Tertullian in his treatise on Baptism, having compared the water used in that sacrament to the pool of Bethesda, carries on the analogy by supposing an angel to give to the baptismal water its spiritual efficacy, “The angel, who witnesses the baptism, prepares the way for the Holy Ghost, which is to follow, by the washing away of sins; which washing faith obtains, being sealed in the Father, and Son, and Holy Ghost. For if ‘in three witnesses every word shall be established ^q,’ how much more is the number of the divine names sufficient for the confidence of our hope, when we have by means of the blessing the same persons as

° CLEM. ALEX. *Pædag.* l. i. c. 6. p. 123. Ὁ θαύματος μυστικῶν· εἰς μὲν ὁ τῶν ὅλων Πατήρ· εἰς δὲ καὶ ὁ τῶν ὅλων Λόγος· καὶ τὸ Πνεῦμα τὸ Ἅγιον ἐν, καὶ τὸ αὐτὸ πανταχοῦ.

♀ CLEM. ALEX. *Pædag.* l. iii. c. ult. Ἰλαθὶ τοῖς σοῖς, Παῖδαγωγέ, παιδίοις, Πατὴρ, ἡνίοχε Ἰσ-

ραήλ, Υἱὲ καὶ Πατὴρ, ἐν ἄμφω, Κύριε, καὶ πάρασχε.— Αἰνούντας εὐχαριστεῖν, αἰνεῖν, τῷ μόνῳ Πατρὶ καὶ Υἱῷ, Υἱῷ καὶ Πατρὶ, παιδαγωγῷ καὶ διδασκάλῳ Υἱῷ· σὸν καὶ τῷ Ἁγίῳ Πνεύματι, πάντα τῷ ἐν· ἐν ᾧ τὰ πάντα· δι’ ὃν τὰ πάντα ἐν· δι’ ὃν τὸ αἰῶ.

^q Matt. xviii. 16.

witnesses of our faith, whom we have also as the promisers of our salvation? But when both the witnessing of our faith and the promise of our salvation is given under the pledge of three persons, there is necessarily added a mention of the church; for where the three are, that is, the Father, and Son, and Holy Ghost, there is the church, which is the body of the three^r." In this passage Tertullian speaks of the three Persons in the Trinity as three witnesses, thereby evidently implying his belief in the distinction of the Persons; but his belief will be seen more clearly in his treatise against Praxeas; indeed the whole of that treatise might be referred to as shewing his belief in the Trinity. It will be sufficient however to extract two or three of the most remarkable passages.

Be it remembered that this treatise was written expressly against one who confounded the three persons of the Trinity, and maintained that the second and third persons were not distinct, but merely modes and energies of the Father. Here therefore for the first time we find the question brought before us as a subject of controversy; Tertullian asserts the catholic doctrine, that which had been received without question until his time: we must therefore expect more precision in his lan-

^r TERTULL. *de Baptismo*, c. 6. Angelus baptismi arbiter superventuro Spiritui Sancto vias dirigit ablutione delictorum, quam fides impetrat, ob-signata in Patre, et Filio, et Spiritu Sancto.—Quum au-

tem sub tribus et testatio fidei et sponsio salutis pignerentur, necessario adjicitur Ecclesiæ mentio; quoniam ubi tres, id est, Pater, et Filius, et Spiritus Sanctus, ibi Ecclesia, quæ trium corpus est.

guage, than in that of his predecessors. The following passage asserts in the plainest terms the trinity of persons, and the unity of the Godhead, each person being God, and yet but one God, of one substance.

“He thinks that we cannot in any other way believe in one God, than if we say that the very same person is Father, and Son, and Holy Ghost: as if *one* might not thus also be *all*, so as *all* proceed from *one*, namely, by unity of substance, and still the mystery of the divine economy be preserved, which divides the unity into a trinity, pointing out three, Father, and Son, and Holy Ghost; three however not in condition but in order; not in substance, but in form; not in power, but in species; but of one substance, and of one condition, and of one power; for there is one God, from whom those orders, and forms, and species are reckoned in the name of Father, and Son, and Holy Ghost^a.”

And in the following section he says, “These persons assume the number and disposition of the trinity to be a division of the unity; whereas the unity, from itself deriving a trinity is, not de-

^a TERTULL. *adv. Prax.* c. 2. Unicum Deum non alias putat credendum, quam si ipsum eundemque, et Patrem et Filium, et Spiritum Sanctum dicat; quasi non sic quoque unus sit omnia, dum ex uno omnia, per substantiæ scilicet unitatem; et nihilominus custodiatur οἰκονομίας sacramentum, quæ unitatem in trinitatem disponit, tres

dirigens, Patrem, et Filium, et Spiritum Sanctum. Tres autem, non statu, sed gradu; nec substantiâ, sed formâ; nec potestate, sed specie; unius autem substantiæ, et unius status, et unius potestatis; quia unus Deus, ex quo et gradus isti et formæ et species, in nomine Patris, et Filii, et Spiritus Sancti deputantur.

stroyed by it, but has its different offices performed, They therefore boast that two and three Gods are preached by us, but they assume themselves to be worshippers of one God; as if the unity, irrationally contracted, did not create heresy; and a trinity, rationally considered, did not constitute truth^t."

In another passage Tertullian uses the word *persona*, in reference to the distinction of the Trinity; that he uses it in the same sense that we attach to "person," as expressing distinct individuality, and not in its original and classical sense of "character," I shall not now stop to prove, but refer the reader to the unanswerable remarks of Dr. Burton^u. Having quoted several passages from Scripture, in which the Father is spoken of as having a Son, he proceeds:

"In these few instances therefore the distinction of the Trinity is very plainly shewn. For there is the Spirit who speaks; and the Father to whom he speaks; and the Son of whom he speaks. So also the other words which are spoken, at one time to the Father concerning the Son; or to the Son at another time concerning the Father; or to the Father at another time concerning the Spirit, establish each person in his own individuality^x."

^t TERTULL. *adv. Prax.* c. 3. Numerum et dispositionem trinitatis divisionem præsumunt unitatis; quando unitas, ex semetipsâ derivans trinitatem, non destruat ab illâ, sed administretur. Itaque duos et tres jam jactitant à nobis prædicari; se vero unius Dei cultores præsumunt; quasi non et

unitas irrationaliter collecta hæresim faciat, et trinitas rationaliter expensa, veritatem constituat.

^u *Testimonies to the Doctrine of the Trinity*, p. 73, 74.

^x TERTULL. *adv. Prax.* c. 11. His itaque paucis tam manifeste distinctio Trinitatis exponitur. Est enim ipse qui

Dr. Burton has extracted nearly twenty passages from Tertullian in which he uses expressions equally clear; I must content myself with one more. Tertullian, as well as all the other Fathers, interpreted several expressions in the Old Testament as relating to the first and second persons of the Trinity, he was consequently accused of preaching two Gods and two Lords, this he denies, and says; “We do indeed distinguish two, the Father and the Son, and moreover three with the Holy Ghost, according to the method of the divine economy, which composes that number, lest, as your perversions bring it to pass, the Father himself should be believed to have been born, and to have suffered, which may not be believed, because it has not been so delivered to us. We however never with our mouth name two Gods or two Lords; although the Father is God, and the Son is God, and the Holy Ghost is God, and each is God^y.”

Hippolytus, who follows close upon Tertullian, has also left us a controversial treatise written for the express purpose of asserting the orthodox faith against Noetus, who held doctrines very similar to those of Praxeas, but perhaps more decidedly Pa-

pronuntiat Spiritus, et Pater ad quem pronuntiat, et Filius de quo pronuntiat. Sic et cætera, quæ nunc ad Patrem de Filio, vel ad Filium, nunc ad Filium de Patre, vel ad Patrem, nunc ad Spiritum pronuntiantur, unamquamque personam in suâ proprietate constituunt.

^y TERTULL. *adv. Prax.* c.

13. Duos quidem definimus, Patrem et Filium, et jam tres cum Spiritu Sancto.— Duos tamen Deos et duos Dominos nunquam ex ore nostro proferimus; non quasi non et Pater Deus, et Filius Deus, et Spiritus Sanctus Deus, et Deus unusquisque.

tripassian; this must be borne in mind by those who may think that the expressions used by Hippolytus favour the Sabellian notions of the Son and the Holy Ghost being operations of the Father:

“He must of necessity, even against his will, acknowledge the Father God Almighty, and Christ Jesus, the Son of God, who is God and became man, to whom the Father subjected all things except himself and the Holy Ghost, and that these are in this manner three. But if he wishes to learn how God is proved to be one, let him know that his essence is one, and as far as relates to his essence, he is one God: but with respect to the dispensation, his manifestation is threefold ².”

The passage next to be quoted will give occasion to some remarks, which will be equally applicable to an extract from Tertullian in a former page ^a. Noetus, as well as Praxeas, accused the orthodox party of believing in two Gods, they endeavoured to overturn the established doctrine, and put forward their own as new but as truly Scriptural; they did not attack others as heretics for introducing a novel doctrine, but professed to try and explain Scripture by human reason; the obvious conclusion is that a belief in the divinity of the Son and the Holy Ghost was general throughout the

² HIPPOLYTI c. *Noetum*, c. 8. Ἀνάγκην οὖν ἔχει καὶ μὴ θέλων ὁμολογεῖν Πατέρα Θεὸν παντοκράτορα, καὶ Χριστὸν Ἰησοῦν Υἱὸν Θεοῦ Θεὸν ἀνθρώπου γενόμενον, ᾧ πάντα Πατὴρ ὑπέταξε παρεκτός ἑαυτοῦ καὶ Πνεύματος Ἁγίου, καὶ τούτους εἶναι

οὕτως τρία. Εἰ δὲ βούλεται μαθεῖν, πῶς εἰς Θεὸς ἀποδείκνυται, γινώσκω ὅτι μία δύναμις τούτου, καὶ ὅσον μὲν κατὰ τὴν δύναμιν, εἰς ἐστὶ Θεός· ὅσον δὲ κατὰ τὴν οἰκονομίαν, τριχὴς ἡ ἐπίδειξις.

^a See above note *y*.

Church. It may be objected that this mode of arguing makes as much against, as for, the doctrine of the Trinity, for that as Praxeas, Noetus, and others, only found fault with the belief in *two* Gods, and not in *three*, therefore the conclusion must be that the divinity of the Holy Ghost, as a separate person, was not so much as thought of in those days. To which I answer, that prior to the Council of Nice, the divinity of the Holy Ghost was scarcely questioned, and that moreover in almost all instances where this objection of there being two Gods is answered, the trinity of persons is asserted: thus in the passage before quoted from Tertullian, (p. 29.) he says in answer to this same objection, “We do indeed distinguish two, the Father and the Son, and moreover three with the Holy Ghost;” so the same remark is forestalled in the following passage from Hippolytus;

He had quoted the beginning of St. John’s Gospel, and proceeds, “If then the Word is with God, being himself God, why would any one say that two Gods are spoken of? I never speak of two Gods, but one; yet of two persons, and a third dispensation, the grace of the Holy Ghost. For the Father is one; but there are two persons; because there is also the Son; and the third is the Holy Ghost. The Father commands, the Word performs, and the Son is manifested, whereby the Father is believed. A dispensation of agreement is comprehended in one God, for God is one. For it is the Father who commands, the Son who obeys, and the Holy Ghost who gives wisdom.

The Father is ‘above all,’ the Son is ‘through all,’ and the Holy Ghost is ‘in all.’ We cannot in any other way form a conception of one God, unless we really believe in the Father, and the Son, and the Holy Ghost. For the Jews glorified the Father, but did not give thanks, for they did not acknowledge the Son. The disciples acknowledged the Son, but not in the Holy Ghost; wherefore they also denied him. The paternal Word therefore knowing the dispensation and the will of the Father, that the Father wished to be glorified in no other way than this, after his resurrection commanded his disciples, saying, ‘Go, teach all nations, baptizing them in the name of the Father, and of the Son, and of the Holy Ghost;’ shewing that whoever omits any one of these, does not perfectly glorify God. For by this Trinity the Father is glorified. For the Father willed, the Son executed, the Spirit manifested ^b.”

The following fanciful interpretation of Psalm cxxii. 2. shews Origen’s belief in the Trinity in Unity; and the more so, that it is quite incidental; if his persuasion had not been very strong he would not have gone out of his way to find expressions to which he attached no meaning: the words are these: “Even as the eyes of servants look unto the hand of their masters, and as the eyes of a

^b HIPPOLYTI c. *Noetum*. c. 14. — Δύο μὲν οὐκ ἔρῳ Θεοὺς ἀλλ’ ἡ ἓνα, πρόσωπα δὲ δύο, οἰκονομίαν δὲ τρίτην, τὴν χάριν τοῦ Ἁγίου Πνεύματος. Πατὴρ μὲν γὰρ εἷς, πρόσωπα δὲ δύο, ὅτι καὶ ὁ Υἱὸς, τὸ δὲ

τρίτον τὸ Ἅγιον Πνεῦμα. — Οἰκονομία συμφωνίας συνάγεται εἰς ἓνα Θεόν· εἷς γὰρ ἔστιν ὁ Θεός, — Διὰ γὰρ τῆς τριάδος ταύτης Πατὴρ δοξάζεται, Πατὴρ γὰρ ἠθέλησεν, Υἱὸς ἐποίησεν, Πνεῦμα ἐφάνησεν.

maiden unto the hand of her mistress ; even so our eyes wait upon the Lord our God, until he have mercy upon us." Origen observes, " The servants of their masters, the Father and Son, are the spirit and body ; and the handmaid of her mistress, the Holy Ghost, is the soul ; and the three are the Lord our God ; for the three are one. ^c"

The following passages from Cyprian are too plain to require comment.

" When the Lord after his resurrection sent forth his disciples, he instructed and taught them how they were to baptize, saying, ' All power is given unto me in heaven and in earth : go ye, therefore, and teach all nations, baptizing them in the name of the Father, and of the Son, and of the Holy Ghost ^d.' He implies a Trinity by the mystery of which all nations should be baptized ^e."

And again, in the same Epistle, in which it should be observed he is arguing against the validity and efficaciousness of baptism by heretics ; " If a person may be baptized by heretics, he may therefore obtain remission of sins. If he obtains remission of sins, he is also sanctified, and made the temple of God. If he is sanctified and made the temple of God, I ask, of what God ? If you say, of the Creator, I say he cannot, because he does not believe in him. If, of Christ, neither can

^c ORIGEN. in *Ps.* cxxii. 2. vol. ii. p. 821.—Τὰ δὲ τρία Κύριος ὁ Θεὸς ἡμῶν ἐστίν· οἱ γὰρ τρεῖς τὸ ἓν εἰσιν.

^d Matt. xxviii. 18.

^e CYPRIANI *Ep.* lxxiii. s. 5. ad *Jubaianum*.—Insinuat trinitatem, cujus sacramento gentes baptizarentur.

he who denies Christ to be God, be made his temple. If of the Holy Ghost, since the three are one, how can the Holy Ghost be reconciled to him, who is at enmity either with the Son or the Father^f."

And again, in the same Epistle, "When after the resurrection the Apostles are sent by the Lord to all nations, they are commanded to baptize them, in the name of the Father, and of the Son, and of the Holy Ghost. How then do some say, that a Gentile who is baptized out of the Church, so as it be done in the name of Jesus Christ, any where and in any manner, can obtain remission of sins; when Christ himself orders all nations to be baptized in the full and united Trinity^g."

The title of Novatian's treatise *de Trinitate*, would be sufficient proof of his belief in the Trinity. He does not however in any place mention the three persons, but confines himself to the question of the divinity and the distinct individuality of the Son. Any passages that shew that the Father and the Son are two persons, and both together one God, might be adduced in support of the author's belief in the Trinity: but as I shall have occasion under the second Article to quote from Novatian, it will be sufficient to refer the reader to the extracts there given.

^f Idem, ibid. s. 11.—Cum tres unum sint, quomodo Spiritus Sanctus placatus esse ei potest, qui aut Patris aut Filii inimicus est?

^g Idem, ibid. s. 16.—Quando ipse Christus gentes baptizari jubeat in plenâ et adunatâ trinitate?

Dionysius, bishop of Alexandria, was one of the first to resist the heresy of Sabellius, which began to spread in his time. It must be borne in mind that the tendency of the Sabellian doctrine was to confound the Father and the Son, and to deny the real and separate existence of the latter. Dionysius, in his anxiety to overturn this heresy, seems to have subjected himself to the charge of dividing the substance of the three persons, and so falling into that which was afterwards the Arian heresy. Dionysius, bishop of Rome, summoned a council, and requested the Alexandrian bishop to explain his opinions concerning the Trinity. This he did in a work entitled his “*Refutation and Defence*,” with which the orthodox party were satisfied. Of this work only a few passages have come down to us, which are preserved in a book written by Athanasius for the express purpose of defending him from the charge of Arianism. In the following passage Dionysius defends himself from the accusation of separating the Son from the Father :

“ Each of the two names mentioned by me is inseparable and indivisible from the other. If I mentioned the Father, I also signified the Son in the Father, even before I introduced the name of the Son. Did I introduce the Son ; although I had not spoken of the Father before, He would certainly have had his name anticipated in the Son. If I added the Holy Ghost, I at the same time subjoined both from whence and by whom he came. But these persons are not aware, that the Father, in his relation of Father, is not separated

from the Son; for the name implies union: nor is the Son removed from the Father; for the appellation Father signifies community. In their hands also is the Spirit, which can neither be separated from the person sending, nor from the person conveying. How then, while I make use of these names, can I conceive that these are divided and altogether distinct from each other ^h?"

Athanasius represents Dionysius as saying shortly afterwards, "Thus we expand the Unity into the indivisible Trinity; and again we sum up the undiminished Trinity in the Unity ⁱ."

Athanasius has also preserved to us some passages from the treatise of Dionysius bishop of Rome against Sabellius. Having remarked on the heresy of Sabellius, and condemned that of Marcion, who would have made Christ a mere creature, he proceeds: "We must therefore neither divide the wonderful and divine unity into three God-heads; nor destroy the dignity and exceeding greatness of the Lord, by making him a creature; but we must believe in God the Father Almighty, and in Christ Jesus his Son, and in the Holy Ghost; and that the Word is united with the God of the universe; 'For I,' he says, 'and the Father are one ^k;' and 'I am in the Father, and the Fa-

^h ATHANAS. *de Sent. Dionys.* c. 17.—Πατέρα εἶπον· καὶ πρὶν ἐπαγάγω τὸν Υἱὸν, ἐσήμανα καὶ τοῦτον ἐν τῷ Πατρὶ. Υἱὸν ἐπήγαγον· εἰ καὶ μὴ προειρήκειν τὸν Πατέρα, πάντως ἂν ἐν τῷ Υἱῷ προεἰληπτο. "Ἁγίον Πνεῦμα προσέθηκα, ἀλλ' ἅμα καὶ πόθεν καὶ διὰ τίνος

ἦκεν ἐφ' ἡμῶν.

ⁱ Idem, *ibid.* Οὕτω μὲν ἡμεῖς εἰς τε τὴν τριάδα τὴν μονάδα πλατύνομεν ἀδιαίρετον, καὶ τὴν τριάδα πάλιν ἀμείωτον εἰς τὴν μονάδα συγκεφαλαιούμεθα.

^k John x. 30.

ther in me¹:’ for thus both the divine Trinity, and the holy doctrine of the Unity, will be preserved^m.”

ARTICLE II.

*Of the Word or Son of God, which was made
very Man.*

“ THE Son, which is the Word of the Father, begotten
“ from everlasting of the Father, the very and eternal
“ God, of one substance with the Father, took man’s na-
“ ture in the womb of the blessed Virgin, of her sub-
“ stance: so that two whole and perfect natures, that is
“ to say, the Godhead and Manhood, were joined together
“ in one person, never to be divided, whereof is one
“ Christ, very God, and very Man; who truly suffered,
“ was crucified, dead and buried, to reconcile his Father
“ to us, and to be a sacrifice, not only for original guilt,
“ but also for actual sins of men.”

The first Article having declared God to be one, and “ without parts,” the second proceeds to shew the unity of the Son with the Father, and also to declare more particularly those truths concerning the Son, which are contained in the Scriptures, and which are necessary for Christians to believe.

¹ John xiv. 11.

^m ATHANAS. *de Decret. Syn.*
Nic. c. 26. et apud ROUTH Rel.
Sacr. vol. iii. p. 182. Οὗτ’ οὖν
καταμερίζειν χρὴ εἰς τρεῖς θεότητας
τὴν θανμαστὴν καὶ θείαν μονάδα—
ἀλλὰ πεπιστευμέναι, εἰς Θεὸν Πα-

τέρα παντοκράτορα, καὶ εἰς Χριστὸν
Ἰησοῦν τὸν Υἱὸν αὐτοῦ, καὶ εἰς τὸ
“ Ἅγιον Πνεῦμα” ἠνωσθαι δὲ τῷ Θεῷ
τῶν ὅλων τὸν Λόγον.—οὕτω γὰρ ἂν
καὶ ἡ θεία τριάς, καὶ τὸ ἅγιον κήρυγ-
μα τῆς μοναρχίας διασώζοιτο.

The several propositions contained in this Article are directed against various heresies which have been broached at different times ; for though in its form it is affirmative, it is negative in spirit.

The five several heads into which the Article is here divided will enable me to notice and distinguish the several opinions, which it seems intended to reject.

First, then, the Article asserts, “ *The Son, which is the Word of the Father, to be begotten of everlasting of the Father.*”

It has been already^a observed that the Arians denied the coeternity of the Son with the Father ; but it would perhaps be more correct to suppose that the above words were more immediately directed against those who altogether denied the pre-existence of the Son ; such were the followers of Photinus, bishop of Sirmium in the fourth century : they admitted the miraculous conception, and the birth from the Virgin, but denied the pre-existence of our Saviour ; holding that a certain divine emanation, which they called the Logos or Word, descended upon him after his birth.

Secondly, the Article asserts the divinity of the Son, and his consubstantiality with the Father ; that he is “ *the very and eternal God, of one substance with the Father.*”

It may be hardly necessary in this place to no-

^a Ante, p. 13, 14.

tice the early Jewish heretics, who, having expected a temporal prince, were not easily undeceived; and though they professed to receive the Gospel of Christ, could not bring themselves to believe in his divinity.

The Arians in one sense admitted the pre-existence of the Son; but seemed to think that the Father must have existed before the Son, otherwise that the Son could not be said to have been begotten. They, however, altogether denied the consubstantiality of the Son with the Father. Others again, as the Semi-Arians, who softened down the doctrines of Arius, professed to believe the consubstantiality, but in a peculiar sense, they held it to be not by nature, only by privilege. To these may be added the Socinians, and all who call themselves Unitarians.

Thirdly, it is asserted, that the Son of God "*took man's nature in the womb of the blessed Virgin, of her substance;*" in opposition to those who admitted only the divinity of Christ.

Many of the early heretics, amongst many fantastic notions with regard to the creation of the world, spirits, and the Deity, maintained that Christ had not a real, but only an apparent body; consequently they denied his humanity, and considered the scriptural accounts of his life, crucifixion, burial, and resurrection, to be allegorical or mystical.

And Eutyches in the fifth century, in his zeal against the errors of Nestorius, which will be pre-

sently noticed, ran into the opposite extreme, and denied the human nature of Christ; he argued that the human nature could not possibly co-exist with the divine. He was condemned by the general council of Chalcedon, in the year 451. His followers were called Monophysites; and it is said that many are still to be found in the Eastern Church who hold his opinions.

The Article next proceeds to assert the conjunction of the divine and human natures in one person, which controversialists have designated by the expression "hypostatic union."

In the fourth century, Apollinaris, who is said to have been bishop of Laodicea, gave a name to a sect which, following him, has denied the incarnation and hypostatic union, maintaining that the Word must have supplied the place of a human soul to Jesus Christ, thereby denying him to be "perfect man."

In the fifth century Nestorius advanced a new doctrine; he admitted the two natures, but not the hypostatic union; his followers, however, have denied the charge of rejecting the union of the two natures in one person;—perhaps his doctrine would not be unfairly described as making two persons with one appearance. The words "one Christ" are, perhaps, inserted in this Article with a view to this particular heresy; as "very God and very man" is in opposition to those who held that the Logos or Word supplied the place of a human soul.

Nestorius was made bishop of Constantinople in the year 428, and condemned by the general council at Ephesus in 431.

Lastly, the Son “*truly suffered, was crucified, dead and buried, to reconcile his Father to us, etc.*” The word “truly” seems to be put in opposition to those who denied the reality of Christ’s human nature. The concluding words express the doctrine of the atonement, but as that will be more conveniently considered under the eleventh Article, I shall not now adduce many passages from the Fathers with a view to illustrate that point.

I. The pre-existence and eternal generation of the Son.

The following passage from the Shepherd of Hermas attributes to Christ an uncreated nature, as well as pre-existence before the world was made; “The Son of God is more ancient than any created thing, so that he was present in counsel with his Father at the creation^b.”

And Ignatius, “Jesus Christ, who was with the Father before all ages, and appeared in the end^c.”

And very shortly before his martyrdom, when questioned by Trajan, to a question whether the Romans had not God in them, he answered, “Alas, O king, that you call the idols of the Gen-

^b HERMÆ *Pastor*, l. iii. Simil. 9. s. 12. Filius quidem Dei omni creaturâ antiquior est, ita ut in consilio Patri suo adfuerit ad condendam creaturam.

^c IGNAT. *Ep. ad Magnes.* s. 6.—^aὉς πρὸ αἰώνων παρὰ Πατρὶ ᾤν, καὶ ἐν τέλει ἐφάνη. The whole section will be inserted hereafter under Article xxiii.

tiles, gods! For there is one true God, who is the Creator of the heavens and the earth, and the sea, and all things that are in them. There is one Christ Jesus, the only-begotten Son of God, of whose kingdom there is no end. Whom if thou also shouldst acknowledge, O king, thy people, and diadem, and regal throne, would be much more firmly established ^d.”

So Justin Martyr : “ The Word of wisdom testifieth this unto me, himself being God, begotten of the Father of all things ; being also the word, and the wisdom, and the power, and the glory of him that did beget him ^e :” he then quotes Proverbs viii. from verse 22. to the end of the chapter, as spoken by Christ concerning himself. And again ; “ You understand, O hearers, if you attend, that the word hath declared that this which was begotten was begotten of the Father, before all created things whatsoever ; and that he which was begotten is another in number from him that did beget him, every one will confess ^f.”

Irenæus having shewn how incapable man, a finite being, is of comprehending what is infinite, says, “ For thou art not uncreated, O man, nor didst thou always co-exist with God, as his own Word has done ; but by means of his eminent

^d IGNAT. *Martyr.* s. 4.—Εἷς Χριστὸς Ἰησοῦς, ὁ τοῦ Θεοῦ μονογενὴς Υἱός, οὗ τῆς βασιλείας οὐκ ἔστι τέλος.

^e JUSTIN. *Dial. cum Tryph.* c. 61.—Αὐτὸς ὦν οὗτος ὁ Θεὸς ἀπὸ τοῦ Πατρὸς τῶν ὅλων γεννηθείς—.

^f Idem, c. 129.—Ὅτι γεγενῆσθαι ὑπὸ τοῦ Πατρὸς τοῦτο τὸ γέννημα πρὸ πάντων ἀπλῶς τῶν κτισμάτων ὁ λόγος ἐδήλου, καὶ τὸ γεννώμενον τοῦ γεννῶντος ἀριθμῷ ἑτερόν ἐστι, πᾶς ὅστις οὖν ὁμολογήσειε.

goodness, now receiving the beginning of being, thou learnest by degrees from the Word the ordinances of God who made thee^g.”

And again, in the words immediately following a passage before quoted^h, he says, “He, the Father of our Lord Jesus Christ, by his own Word, who is his Son, is revealed and made manifest to all, to whom he is revealed; for they know him, to whom the Son has revealed him. But the Son always co-existing with the Father, in times past and from the beginning ever reveals the Father, both to angels and archangels, and principalities and powers, and to all to whom the Father will reveal himselfⁱ.”

Clemens Alexandrinus, in a passage hereafter given under this Article, says that Christ “was in the beginning, and before existed,”

And Tertullian, “Christ our Lord has called himself Truth, (John xiv. 6.), not custom. If Christ has been always, and is before all things, Truth is equally eternal and ancient^k.”

Hippolytus, in his *Demonstratio contra Judæos*, argues that the last punishment of the Jews was greater than all former ones, for that their crime in having crucified the Son of God, was greater than all they had before committed. He asks,

^g IRENÆI l. ii. c. 25. s. 3. Non enim infectus es, O homo, neque semper co-existebas Deo, sicut proprium ejus Verbum.

^h Art. I. p. 9.

ⁱ IRENÆI lib. ii. c. 30. s. ult.—Semper autem coexistens

Filius Patri, olim et ab initio semper revelat Patrem—.

^k TERTULL. *de Virg. Verland.* c. 1. Si semper Christus, et prior omnibus, æque veritas sempiterna et antiqua res.

“ Why was the Temple destroyed ? Was it for the making of the calf in days of old ? Was it for the idolatry of the people ? Was it for the blood of the prophets ? Was it for the adulteries and fornications of Israel ? By no means ; for they always obtained pardon and mercy for all those things : but it was because they killed the Son of their Benefactor ; for it is he who is co-eternal with the Father¹. ”

The eternal generation of the Son is expressly declared in the following passage from Origen : “ For God did not begin to be a Father, having been prevented, like men, who become fathers, by not being able yet to become fathers. For if God is always perfect, and the power of being a father is present with Him ; and if it is good for him to be the Father of such a Son, why does he delay it, and deprive himself of what is good ? and why not, if we may so speak, be Father of a Son, from the time that he is able to be so^m ? ”

And Novatian ; “ But he who is before all time must be said to have always been in the Father. For time cannot be assigned to him who is before time. For he was always in the Father, lest the Father should not always be a Fatherⁿ. ”

“ For it is not, that God was without a Son, and then begat one ; but the term *Son* means that he

¹ HIPPOLYTI *Demonstr. c. Judæos*, c. 7.—Αὐτὸς γάρ ἐστιν ὁ τῷ Πατρὶ συναϊδὺς.

^m ORIGEN. *è lib. 1^o. in GENES.* vol. ii. p. 1. Οὐ γὰρ ὁ Θεὸς Πατὴρ εἶναι ἤρξατο, κωλύμενος, ὥς

οἱ γινόμενοι πατέρες ἄνθρωποι, κ.τ.λ.

ⁿ NOVAT. *de Trinitate*, c. 31. Sed qui ante omne tempus est, semper in Patre fuisse dicendus est.—Semper enim in Patre, ne Pater non semper sit Pater.

has his existence not of himself, but of the Father^o." And shortly afterwards, "The Son alone always existing with the Father, and filled with him that is essentially, himself also is essentially, being of the Father^p." Again, "I have written, and now write, and confess, and believe, and preach, that Christ is co-eternal with the Father, the only-begotten Son and Word of the Father^q."

II. In the second place, "*Christ is God, of one substance with the Father.*"

From a passage quoted from Barnabas, and given under the fifth head of this Article, it will appear how early the words in Genesis i. 26, 'Let us make man' were considered to refer to Christ; we may add another passage from the same author, in which he refers to him those words of Ezekiel^r, which the prophet attributes to God the Father, and from which we may infer that Barnabas believed in the divinity of Christ, and his union with the Father. " 'Lo!' saith the Lord, 'I will take away from them their stony hearts, and will give them hearts of flesh:' because he was about to be manifested in the flesh, and to dwell among us^s."

Clemens Romanus also calls Christ God, as the sufferings which he mentions to have been seen

^o DIONYS. *ex Elench. et Apol.* p. 87. Οὐ γὰρ δὴ τούτων ἄγονος ὢν ὁ Θεὸς εἶτα ἐπαιδοποιήσατο· ἀλλ' ὅτι μὴ παρ' ἑαυτοῦ ὁ Υἱός, ἀλλ' ἐκ τοῦ Πατρὸς ἔχει τὸ εἶναι.

^p Idem, *ibid.* p. 89. Μόνος δὲ ὁ Υἱὸς ἀεὶ συνὼν τῷ Πατρὶ, κ. τ. λ.

^q Idem, *adv. Paul Samos.*

Qu. x. p. 270.—κηρύττω συναϊδιον τῷ Πατρὶ τὸν Χριστὸν, τὸν μονογενῆ Υἱὸν καὶ Λόγον τοῦ Πατρὸς.

^r Ezek. xi. 19. and xxxvi. 26.

^s BARNABÆ *Ep.* c. 6. Ἴδού, λέγει Κύριος, ἐξελῶ τούτων, κ. τ. λ. —ὅτι ἐμελλεν ἐν σαρκὶ φανεροῦσθαι, καὶ ἐν ἡμῖν κατοικεῖν.

can only be those of Christ. “Ye have all been humble-minded, arrogant in nothing, subjected rather than subjecting, giving rather than receiving, being satisfied with the supplies sent from God; and carefully attending to *his* words, you have them deeply fixed in your minds, and *his* sufferings were before your eyes^t.” And in another place he quotes several verses of the thirty-fourth Psalm, as spoken by Christ; “But it is faith in Christ that confirmeth all these things: for he himself thus calleth us by the Holy Ghost, ‘Come, ye children, and hearken unto me; I will teach you the fear of the Lord^u;’” and so on to the 19th verse. Dr. Burton has remarked, “It might perhaps be said, that the words in this Psalm were spoken by David, and not by God. This remark, however, does not affect the argument. Clement considered that they were spoken by God: and since he says in this place that they were spoken by Christ, it is evident that in the opinion of Clement it was indifferent whether he referred them to Jehovah or to Christ^x.” I agree with the conclusion here drawn, but should rather say, (and it would make the argument from Clement’s words still stronger,) that David, being inspired by the Holy Ghost, spake those words which were put into his mouth as the words of Christ.

^t CLEMENTIS *Epist.* 1^a. c. 2.
—καὶ τὰ παθήματα αὐτοῦ ἦν πρὸ
ὀφθαλμῶν ὑμῶν.

^u Idem, c. 22.—Καὶ γὰρ αὐ-
τὸς διὰ τοῦ Πνεύματος τοῦ Ἁγίου

οὕτως προσκαλεῖται ἡμᾶς, Δεῦτε,
κ. τ. λ.

^x *Testimonies to the Divinity
of Christ*, p. 9.

We have already ^y seen that Ignatius said that Jesus Christ was with the Father before all ages, that he is beyond all time, eternal, invisible; we shall now find that he calls him God. He thus commences his Epistle to the Ephesians; “Ignatius, to the church at Ephesus, which was pre-ordained before the worlds, according to the will of the Father and of Jesus Christ our God ^z.” And after the address, he says ;

“I approve in God of the much-beloved name that ye have justly acquired, by faith and love in Jesus Christ our Saviour ; being imitators of God, having animated yourselves by the blood of God, ye have performed perfectly the congenial work ^a.”

In the following passage Justin declares that God alone can foretell the future, and that Christ did foretell what has since come to pass ; whence the conclusion is obvious, that Christ is God. Having spoken of the sufferings to which the early Christians were exposed, he says “ That all these things would come to pass, our teacher, the Son and Apostle of God the Father, and Lord of all things, even Jesus Christ, from whom also we have obtained the name of Christians, foretold ; wherefore we are also confirmed in all the things that were taught by him, since whatsoever things he before declared should happen, have in deed come to pass. For it is the work of God, to declare

^y Ante, p. 41.

^z IGNAT. *Epist. ad Ephes.*
c. 1. Καὶ Ἰησοῦ Χριστοῦ τοῦ
θεοῦ ἡμῶν.

^a Idem, *ibid.*—Μιμηταὶ ὄντες
θεοῦ, ἀναζωπυρήσαντες ἐν αἵματι
θεοῦ, κ. τ. λ.

things before they happen, and that they should be shewn to happen, as was foretold by him ^b.”

Athenagoras, in answer to the charge of atheism brought against Christians, calls Christ God, “That we are not atheists, since we consider as God the Creator of this universe, and the Word, which is of him, has been proved; if not suitably to the subject, at least to the utmost of my power ^c.”

Melito, bishop of Sardis, also says, “We are not worshippers of senseless stones, but of the only God, who was before all things, and is above all things: and also of his Christ, who was truly God, the Word, before the worlds ^d.”

And Irenæus expressly calls Christ God, “Neither can any of those things which have been made, and are in subjection, be compared to the Word of God, ‘by whom all things were made;’ who is our Lord Jesus Christ. Since angels, and archangels, and thrones, and powers, were both appointed by him who is God over all, and made by his Word, John has thus told us; for after he had said of the Word of God, that he was in the Father, he added, ‘All things were made by him, and without him was not any thing made’ ^e.”

^b JUSTIN. *Apol.* 1^a. c. 12. Γενήσεσθαι ταῦτα πάντα προεῖπε, φημί, ὁ ἡμέτερος διδάσκαλος—Ἰησοῦς Χριστός—Θεοῦ ἔργον ἐστὶ, πρὶν ἢ γενέσθαι εἶπεν, καὶ οὕτως δειχθῆναι ὡς προεῖρηται.

^c ATHENAG. *Leg. pro Christ.* c. 30. Ὡς μὲν οὖν οὐκ ἔσμεν ἄθεοι, Θεὸν ἄγοντες τὸν ποιητὴν τοῦδε τοῦ παντός, καὶ τὸν παρ’ αὐτοῦ Λόγον—ἐλήλεγκται.

^d MELITO, *ex Apol.* apud ROUTH, *Rel. Sacr.* vol. i. p. 112.—καὶ ἔτι τοῦ Χριστοῦ αὐτοῦ, ὅντως Θεοῦ Λόγου πρὸ αἰώνων, ἔσμεν θρησκευταί.

^e IRENÆI l. iii. c. 8. s. 2.—Quoniam enim sive angeli, sive archangeli, sive throni, sive dominationes, ab eo qui super omnes est Deus et constituta sunt et facta per Verbum ejus.—

One of the first chapters in the *Cohortatio ad Gentes* of Clemens Alexandrinus, in which a Christian's faith is spoken of, has the following passage, in which it is expressly declared that Christ is God, and that in him are united the two natures of God and man. Having said that man was created by the Word, which is now called Christ, he proceeds, "This Word, therefore, that is, Christ, is both the cause of our original being, for he was in God, and of our well-being; and now this same Word, who alone is both God and man, hath appeared unto men, as the cause of all good things to us; by whom being instructed in well-being we are conducted unto eternal life. For according to that inspired Apostle of the Lord^f; 'The grace of God that bringeth salvation hath appeared to all men, teaching us, that, denying ungodliness and worldly lusts, we should live soberly, righteously, and godly, in this present world; looking for that blessed hope, and the glorious appearing of the great God, and our Saviour Jesus Christ.' This is the new song, the appearance, which has now shone forth amongst us, of the Word who was in the beginning, and before existed. The Saviour who before existed, hath appeared lately; he hath appeared, who is in Him that is: that is to say the Word, who was with God; the Teacher hath appeared, by whom all things were created; the Word, who also in the beginning gave life when he formed us, as the Creator, hath taught us to live well, appearing as a Teacher, that he might

^f Tit. ii. 11.

afterwards as God, bestow upon us eternal life^g.”

We have already seen what Tertullian meant by the name God^h; in the following passage he calls Christ God, and declares him to be of one substance with the Father, “Neither are we ashamed concerning Christ, since it delights us to be judged and condemned under his name. Him we have learnt to be produced from God, and to have been begotten by production, and therefore the Son of God, and called God from the unity of substanceⁱ.”

“He that descends with faith to the washing of regeneration, bids farewell to the evil one, and is numbered with Christ; he denies the enemy, and confesses that Christ is God^k.” We have seen under the first Article^l what Cyprian meant by the name of God; no doubt therefore can be entertained of his entire belief in the divine nature of Christ; “If we cannot persuade some persons, so as to make them please Christ, let us at least, as far as is in our power, please Christ our Lord and God, by observing his precepts^m.”

And in a letter to Jubaianus, before quoted,

^g CLEM. ALEX. *Cohort. ad Gentes*, c. 1. Οὗτος γοῦν ὁ Λόγος ὁ Χριστὸς καὶ τοῦ εἶναι πάσαι ἡμᾶς, ἣν γὰρ ἐν Θεῷ καὶ τοῦ εἶναι νῦν δὴ ἐπεφάνη ἀνθρώποις αὐτὸς οὗτος ὁ Λόγος, ὁ μόνος ἄμφω, Θεός τε καὶ ἄνθρωπος, ἀπάντων ἡμῖν αἴτιος ἀγαθῶν.—

^h Ante, p. 3.

ⁱ TERTULL. *Apol.* c. 21.—Hunc ex Deo prolatum didicimus, et prolatione generatum,

et idcirco Filium Dei, et Deum dictum, ex unitate substantiæ.

^k HIPPOL. *Hom. in Theophan.* c. 10.—ἐμολογεῖ δὲ τὸ Θεὸν εἶναι τὸν Χριστόν.

^l Ante, p. 4.

^m CYPRIANI. *Epist.* lxii. s. ult.—Nos certe, quod nostrum est, Christo Domino et Deo nostro, præcepta ejus servando, placeamus.

in which he argues that baptism administered by heretics is invalid, Cyprian thus expresses himself; "If any one may be baptized by heretics, he may also obtain remission of sins. If he has obtained remission of sins, he is also sanctified and made the temple of God. If he is sanctified, and made the temple of God, I ask of what God? If you say of the Creator, he cannot, because he does not believe in him? If you say of Christ, neither can that man be the temple of God, who denies Christ to be Godⁿ." It may be remarked also that the principal object of Cyprian's second book of Testimonies against the Jews, is by a citation of texts to shew that Christ is God.

"The same rule of truth teaches us to believe, after the Father, also in the Son of God, Christ Jesus, who is the Lord our God, but the Son of God, of that God who is one and alone, the Creator of all things^o."

Dionysius of Alexandria defending himself against the charge of Arianism, used the expression "of one substance" which was afterwards the cause of such vehement disputes in the church, though it would seem from his words, that it had been used by writers before him; he is referring to his book

ⁿ Idem. *Epist.* lxxiii. s. 11. Si peccatorum remissam consecutus est, et sanctificatus est, et templum Dei factus est, quæro cujus Dei? Si Creatoris, non potuit, quia in eum non credidit. Si Christi, nec hujus fieri potest templum, qui negat Deum Christum. Ante p. 33.

^o NOVAT. *de Trinit.* c. 9. Eadem regula veritatis docet nos credere post Patrem etiam in Filium Dei Christum Jesum Dominum Deum nostrum, sed Dei Filium, hujus Dei, qui et unus et solus est, Conditor scilicet rerum omnium.

against Sabellius, and says, “In which I have proved that the accusation which they bring against me is false, of saying that Christ was not of one substance with the Father^p.”

And in his letter against Paul of Samosata, speaking of Christ he says, “He was by nature Lord and the Word of the Father, by whom the Father made all things, and said by the holy fathers to be of one substance with the Father^q.”

Thirdly. “*The Son of God took man’s nature in the womb of the blessed Virgin of her substance.*”

Thus Ignatius, in his Epistle to the Ephesians, “our God Jesus Christ was conceived by Mary, according to the dispensation of God, of the seed indeed of David, but of the Holy Ghost^r.”

“For what does a man profit me, if he praises me, but blasphemes my Lord, not confessing that he was truly in the flesh? Now he that does not say this, altogether denies him, and is in death. But their names, since they are unbelievers, I did not think fitting to write to you. God forbid that I should mention any of them, until they shall repent unto the passion, which is our resurrection^s.”

Under the first Article has been given the creed which Irenæus said the church, dispersed over the

^p DIONYS. ALEX. *ex Elench. et Apol.* p. 90.—ὡς οὐ λέγοντος τὸν Χριστὸν ὁμοούσιον εἶναι τῷ Θεῷ.

^q Idem, *adv. Paul Samos.* p. 214.—καὶ ὁμοούσιον τῷ Πατρὶ εἰρημένον ὑπὸ τῶν ἁγίων πατέρων.

^r IGNAT. *Epist. ad Ephes.* s. 18. Ὁ γὰρ Θεὸς ἡμῶν Ἰησοῦς

ὁ Χριστὸς ἐκνοφορήθη ὑπὸ Μαρίας κατ’ οἰκονομίαν Θεοῦ, ἐκ σπέρματος μὲν Δαβίδ, Πνεύματος δὲ Ἀγίου.

^s IGNAT. *Epist. ad Smyrn.* s. 5. Τί γάρ με ὀφελεῖ τις, εἰ ἐμὲ ἐπαινεῖ, τὸν δὲ Κύριον μου βλασφημεῖ μὴ ὁμολογῶν αὐτὸν σαρκοφόρον;—

whole earth, had received from the Apostles; in that is made mention of the incarnation, and in the following he speaks of the birth from a virgin, as well as of the incarnation, and of the union of the two natures. Mentioning Christ he says "who, from his exceeding love towards his creation, submitted to be born of a virgin, himself by himself uniting man to God, and suffered under Pontius Pilate, and rose again, and was received into glory, and is to come in glory, the Saviour of those who are saved, and the Judge of those who are judged^t."

In a commentary on the Gospel of St. Matthew by Clemens Alexandrinus, of which some fragments only are preserved, the birth from the Virgin is alluded to, "The *pearl* is the resplendent and most pure Jesus, whom the Virgin bore from the heavenly illumination; for as a pearl when in flesh, and in the shell and in the water seems to be a liquid and transparent body full of light and spirit, so also God the Word being incarnate is an intellectual light, shining through light and a pure body^u."

Tertullian having remarked on those who improperly interpret all the prophecies figuratively, and speaking of the prophecy of Isaiah (vii. 14.) adds, "the Virgin conceived in the womb, not figuratively; and brought forth Emmanuel, Jesus, who

^t IRENÆI l. iii. c. 4. s. 2.
—Qui propter eminentissimam
erga figmentum suum dilec-
tionem, eam quæ esset ex Vir-
gine generationem sustinuit,

ipse per se hominem adunans
Deo.—

^u CLEM. ALEX. *Fragm.* p.
1014. —Ἰησοῦς, ὃν ἐξ ἀστραπῆς
τῆς θείας ἡ παρθένος ἐγέννησεν—

is God with us, not metaphorically^u." And again, "He who was to consecrate a new birth, ought to have been born in a new way; concerning which the Lord was to give a sign, as Isaiah declared; What is that sign? 'Behold a Virgin shall conceive in her womb and bear a Son.' The Virgin accordingly conceived, and bore Emmanuel, God with us^x."

And Hippolytus says "The Word of God, who was not fleshly, put on the blessed flesh from the blessed Virgin, like a bridegroom wearing a garment for himself, in the suffering of the cross, that by blending our mortal body with his own power, and mingling the corruptible with the incorruptible, and the weak with the strong, he might save lost man^y."

"If any one believe that he who was crucified under Pontius Pilate sojourned in the world as something holy and the cause of salvation; but that he did not receive his birth from the Virgin Mary and the Holy Ghost, but from Joseph and Mary, such a man would be deficient in what is most necessary for entire faith^z."

^u TERTULL. *de Resur. Carnis*, c. 20. Nam et Virgo concepit in utero, non figuratè; et peperit Emanuele, nobiscum Deum, Jesum, non obliquè.

^x Idem, *de Carne Christi*, c. 17. —Concepit igitur Virgo, et peperit Emanuele, nobiscum Deum.

^y HIPPOLYTI *de Antichristo* c. 4. 'Ο Λόγος τοῦ Θεοῦ ἄσαρκος

ὢν, ἐνεδύσατο τὴν ἁγίαν σάρκα ἐκ τῆς ἁγίας παρθένου, κ. τ. λ.

^z ORIGEN *in Joan*, t. xxxii. s. 9. Εἰ τις πιστεύων ὅτι ἐπὶ Ποντίου Πιλάτου σταυρωθεὶς ἱερόν τι χρῆμα καὶ σωτήριον τῷ κόσμῳ ἐπίδεδήμεκεν· ἀλλ' οὐκ ἐκ παρθένου τῆς Μαρίας, καὶ Ἀγίου Πνεύματος τὴν γένεσιν ἀνείληφεν, ἀλλ' ἐξ Ἰωσήφ καὶ Μαρίας, καὶ τουτῷ ἂν λείποι εἰς τὸ πᾶσαν ἔχειν τὴν πίστιν τὰ ἀναγκαῖα.

The argument of the ninth chapter of Cyprian's second book of Testimonies, before mentioned, is "That this was to be the sign of his birth, that he should be born of a Virgin, man and God, Son of man and of God ^a."

And Dionysius of Alexandria considers the birth from the Virgin to have been the fulfilment of prophecy: "Isaiah before this was inspired, and spake of the child, who was God, the mighty God, and the Virgin who conceived ^b."

Fourthly, "*The Hypostatic Union.*"

Ignatius frequently mentions the union of the two natures in one person;

"There is one physician both fleshly and spiritual; made and not made; God incarnate; true life in death; both of Mary and of God; first passible, then impassible; even Jesus Christ our Lord ^c."

And again, "God himself appearing in the form of man, for the renewal of eternal life ^d."

When the Senate at Antioch objected to Ignatius that he confessed the God in whom he trusted was dead, he answered, "My Lord and God Jesus

^a CYPRIANI *Testim.* l. ii. c. 9. Quod hoc futurum esset signum nativitatis ejus, ut de Virgine nasceretur homo et Deus, hominis et Dei Filius.

^b DIONYS. ALEX. *adv. Paul. Samos.* p. 207, 8. — Θεὸν παιδίον κηρύττει, καὶ παρθένον ἐν γαστρὶ λαμβάνουσιν.

^c IGNAT. *Epist. ad Ephes.*

s. 7. Εἰς ἰατρός ἐστιν, σαρκικός τε καὶ πνευματικός, γεννητὸς καὶ ἀγέννητος, ἐν σαρκὶ γενόμενος Θεός, ἐν θανάτῳ ζωὴ ἀληθινή, καὶ ἐκ Μαρίας καὶ ἐκ Θεοῦ, πρῶτον παθητὸς καὶ τότε ἀπαθής.

^d Idem, *ibid.* s. 19. Θεοῦ ἀνθρωπίνως φανερομένου εἰς καινότητα αἰδίου ζωῆς.

Christ, was first made man for our sakes, and for our salvation, and of his own free will he received the cross, and death, and burial ; but he rose again the third day, having thrown down the power of the enemy, and he ascended into heaven, whence he had come, at the same time raising us up from the falling of sin, and leading us back again into paradise, whence we had been evilly cast out, giving us greater blessings than we had before^e.”

Having shewn that the Jews misapplied many passages of Scripture, Justin says, “And to persuade you moreover that you understand nothing of the Scriptures, I will also make mention of another Psalm of David which was spoken by the Holy Spirit, and which you say was spoken in honour of Solomon, who was also your king ; but it was also spoken concerning our Christ. And you deceive yourselves from the equivocal meaning of the words. For where it is said^f, ‘the law of the Lord is blameless’ you do not understand that law which was about to be given after Moses, but that which was delivered by Moses, although God cried out, that he would hereafter give a new law, and a new covenant. And when it is said^g, ‘God give to the king thy judgments,’ since Solomon was a king, you suppose that the Psalm is spoken in honour of him ; whereas the words of the Psalm expressly declare that it is spoken in honour of the eternal King, that is of Christ : for Christ is de-

^e IGNAT. *Martyr.* s. 7. Ὁ
ἐμὸς Κύριος καὶ Θεὸς Ἰησοῦς Χριστός,
πρῶτα μὲν ἄνθρωπος ἐγένετο δι'
ἡμᾶς.—

^f Psalm xviii. 8.

^g Psalm lxxii. 2.

clared to be a king, and priest, and God, and Lord, and angel, and man, and chief-captain, and a stone, and a child born, and first made capable of suffering, then returning into heaven, and again coming with glory, and possessed of the eternal kingdom, as I prove from all the Scriptures^h.” He then quotes the whole Psalm, and shews that there are many expressions contained in it, which could not apply to Solomon, because they were not fulfilled in him.

In the same dialogue Justin also accuses the Jews of having expunged from the Septuagint version of the Scriptures “many passages, which expressly shewed that this Jesus, who was crucified, was spoken of as God and man, and crucified, and deadⁱ.”

In the oration of Tatian, which still survives, we find the following passage, which shews that the union of the two natures was generally received by all Christians, “We are not foolish, nor do we relate idle tales, when we declare that God was born in the form of man^k.”

Melito, in answer to Marcion, who believed that Christ had not a real body, distinctly asserts the union of the two natures, “To those persons, who have any sense, there is no necessity to prove, from the actions performed by Christ after his baptism

^h JUSTIN. *Dial. cum Tryph.*
c. 34. —Ὁ γὰρ Χριστὸς βασι-
λεὺς, καὶ ἱερεὺς, καὶ Θεὸς, καὶ Κύριος,
καὶ ἄγγελος, καὶ ἄνθρωπος—κεκή-
ρυκται.

ⁱ Idem, *ibid.* c. 71. —ἐξ
ὧν διαβρήδην οὗτος αὐτοῦ ὁ σταυρω-

θεὶς, ὅτι Θεὸς, καὶ ἄνθρωπος, καὶ
σταυρούμενος, καὶ ἀποθνήσκων κεκη-
ρυγμένος, ἀποδείκνυται.

^k TATIAN, *Orat. c. Græcos.*
c. 21. —Θεὸν ἐν ἀνθρώπῳ μαρ-
φῇ γεγονέναι καταγγέλλοντες.

that he had real and not an apparent soul and body, a human nature such as ours. For the actions performed by Christ after his baptism, and especially the miracles, manifested and demonstrated to the world his divinity which was hidden in the flesh. For he, being at once perfect God and man, has demonstrated his two substances to us, his divinity by the miracles, performed in the three years that followed his baptism; and his humanity in the thirty years that preceded his baptism; during which period, owing to the imperfection which he had from the flesh, the signs of his divinity were hidden; although he was very God existing before the world¹."

Irenæus also says, "Jesus therefore, as we have said before, united man with God. For if it had not been a man who conquered the adversary of man, the enemy would not have been rightly conquered. And again, if it had not been God who gave salvation, we should not have had it securely. And if man had not been united to God, he could not have partaken of immortality. For it was necessary that the mediator between God and man, by his own relationship to both, should bring both to friendship and unanimity; that he should present man to God, and make God known to man^m."

"There was not one who was known, and an-

¹ MELITO *ex l. de Incarn. Christi*, apud ROUTH *Rel. Sac.* vol. i. p. 115. —Θεὸς γὰρ ὁν ὁμοῦ τε καὶ ἀνθρωπος τίλειος ὁ αὐτὸς, τὰς δύο αὐτοῦ οὐσίας ἐπιστώσατο ἡμῖν.—

^m IRENÆI l. iii. c. 18. s. 7. "Ἦνωσεν οὖν, καθὼς προέφαμεν, τὸν ἀνθρωπον τῷ Θεῷ.—

other who said, ‘ No one knoweth the Father,’ but one and the same, the Father subjecting all things to him and he receiving testimony from all, that he is truly man, and truly God, from the Father, from the Spirit, and from angels, from creation itself, from men, and from apostate spirits, from those who have gone astray, and from the enemy, and last of all from death itselfⁿ. ”

The following passage is valuable, in that Clemens of Alexandria calls Christ “ the *living God* ”—

“ Believe, O man, in him who is man and God ; Believe, O man, in him who suffered, and is worshipped, the living God ; believe, ye that are enslaved, in him that was dead ; all ye men believe in him, who only of all men is God^o. ”

•Tertullian wrote a treatise for the express purpose of proving that Christ did really take upon himself our human flesh : in the following passage he, with his accustomed energy of style and diction, inveighs against Marcion for admitting the crucifixion of Christ, when he denied his birth in the flesh, for that one was as unworthy of God as the other ; he asks,

“ Which is more unworthy of God ? which would he be most ashamed of, to be born or to die ? to bear our flesh or the cross ? to be circumcised or

ⁿ IRENÆI l. iv. c. 6. s. 7. —ab omnibus accipiens testimonium, quoniam vere homo, et quoniam vere Deus.—

^o CLEM. ALEX. *Cohort. ad Gentes*, c. 10.—Πίστευσον,

ἄνθρωπε, ἀνθρώπῳ καὶ Θεῷ· πίστευσον, ἄνθρωπε, τῷ παθόντι, καὶ προσκυνουμένῳ Θεῷ ζῶντι· πιστεύσατε, οἱ δοῦλοι, τῷ νεκρῷ πάντες ἄνθρωποι, πιστεύσατε μόνῳ τῷ πάντων ἀνθρώπων Θεῷ·

pierced?—But answer me this, thou slayer of the truth; was not God really crucified? was he not really dead, as he was really crucified? was he not truly raised again, as being truly dead?—Our faith therefore is vain; and all that we hope in Christ is a phantom. Thou most wicked of men, who excusest the murderers of God! For Christ suffered nothing from them, if he did not really suffer.—Christ would not be called man without flesh; nor the son of man, without some human parent; as neither would he be called God, without the Spirit of God: nor the Son of God, without God for his Father. Thus his origin from each substance rendered him God and man: on one side born, on the other not born; on one side fleshly, on the other spiritual; on one side weak, on the other passing strong; on one side dying, on the other living. Which peculiarity of conditions, the divine and human, with an equal reality of each nature, is proved by the same test, both of spirit and of flesh. His miracles proved the spirit of God; his sufferings proved the flesh of man. If the miracles were not without the Spirit, the sufferings were not without the flesh. If the flesh with the sufferings was feigned, therefore the Spirit with the miracles was false. Why do you halve Christ by a lie? He was altogether reality—If not, he was a phantom, even after his resurrection, when he held forth his hand and his feet for his disciples to examine them—he tricks, and deceives, and deludes the eyes of all, the approach and touch of all. You ought not, therefore, to have made Christ

come from heaven, but from some company of jugglers ; and not God besides being man, but a mere man and a conjurer^p.”

“When he came into the world, he appeared God and man. It is easy to understand that he was man, since he was hungry, and weary, etc. But it is also plain that we may see his divinity, when he is praised by angels, beheld by shepherds, etc. You have seen that according to the flesh he was of David ; but that according to the Spirit he was of God ; wherefore it is proved that the same person was both God and man^q.”

In the following passage Origen is referring to Achan's theft, mentioned in Joshua vii.—“In our disputations we are accustomed to say, that we do not call Christ a mere man, but we confess him to be God and man. But that which is stolen from Jericho is said to be *pure*, that is, *without God* ; which was the cause of sin to him that stole. Therefore let us have no human^r thoughts concerning Christ, but let us confess him to be equally God and man ; because the wisdom of God is said

^p TERTULL. *de Carne Christi*, c. 5.—Itaque utriusque substantiæ census hominem et Deum exhibuit ; hinc natum, inde non natum ; hinc carneum, inde spiritalem ; hinc infirmum, inde præfortem ; hinc morientem, inde viventem.

^q HIPPOLYTI *Fragm.* vol i. p. 225.—Hic procedens in mundum Deus et homo appa-

ruit ;——quapropter probatum est eundem et Deum et hominem.

^r *Nihil purum et humanum* is thus translated by Dr. Burton ; preserving the sense without the risk of misleading the reader, who might require to be reminded of Origen's explanation of *purum*, which is, *sine Deo*.

to be manifold; that by this means we may deserve to be partakers of the Wisdom of God, who is Christ Jesus our Lord, to whom is glory and dominion for ever and ever^s."

Here, as in a former place, it is sufficient to allude to the argument of one of the chapters of Cyprian's Testimonies; the object of the tenth chapter of the second book is to prove, "That Christ is both man and God, formed of each nature, that he might be a Mediator between us and the Father^t."

"Who, therefore, can doubt, when in the last place it is said^u, 'The Word was made flesh and dwelt among us,' to say without hesitation, that Christ, whose birth it was, was both man, because 'he was made flesh,' and God, because he was 'the Word of God'? particularly when he observes in the evangelical scriptures that both these substances united into one agreement for the birth of Christ^x."

Dionysius of Alexandria in answer to Paul, who said that Jesus was a mere man, says "It is therefore absurd to say, that Christ was a man, or that he found favour with God above all men, so as to have God dwell in him, without ascetic and laborious

^s ORIGEN. *in Jes. Nav. Hom. vii. s. ult.*—Deum et hominem confitemur.—Deum pariter atque hominem fateamur.

^t CYPRIANI *Testim.* l. ii. c. 10.—Quod et homo et Deus Christus, ex utroque genere concretus, ut mediator esse in-

ter nos et Patrem posset.

^u John i. 14.

^x NOVAT. *de Trinitat.* c. 13. Quis igitur dubitet—Christum, cujus est nativitas, et quia caro factus est, esse hominem, et quia Verbum Dei, Deum incunctanter edicere esse?—

righteousness ; for Christ is not in name only, but in truth, being the Word before the worlds, Christ the Lord Jesus ; for he himself became man, being incarnate of Mary^y.”

“ For Christ was this, a man filled with unmixed and perfect divinity, and God contained in man^z.”

“ The word being made flesh by the will of God, and being found in fashion as a man^a, was not deprived of his divinity ; for neither in order that he should lose the perfection of his power and glory, did it come to pass^b that he was made poor though he was rich : but that he might undergo death for us sinners^c, ‘ the just for the unjust, that he might bring us to God, being put to death in the flesh, but quickened by the Spirit^d.’ ”

Lastly, The Son “ *truly suffered, was crucified, dead, and buried, to reconcile his Father unto us,*” etc.

It will be sufficient under this head to give only a few extracts in support of the reality of Christ’s sufferings, and that he suffered *for us* : the doctrine

^y DIONYS. ALEX. *adv. Paul. Samos.* p. 205, 6.—

‘Ο γὰρ Χριστὸς, οὐκ ὀνόματι μόνῳ, ἀλλ’ ἀληθείᾳ, πρὸ αἰώνων, ὡς Λόγος, Χριστὸς Κύριος Ἰησοῦς· αὐτὸς γὰρ γέγονεν ἄνθρωπος ὁ σαρκωθείς ἐκ Μαρίας.

^z METHODII *Sympos.* p. 79.
—τοῦτο γὰρ εἶναι τὸν Χριστὸν, ἄνθρωπον ἀκράτῳ θεότητι, καὶ τελείᾳ πεπληρωμένον, καὶ Θεὸν ἐν ἀνθρώπῳ κεχωρημένον.

^a Phil. ii. 8.

^b 2 Cor. viii. 9.

^c 1 Peter iii. 18.

^d PETRUS. ALEX. *apud ROUTH Rel. Sacr.* vol. iii. p. 344
Θελήματι Θεοῦ ὁ Λόγος σὰρξ γενόμενος, καὶ σχήματι εὑρεθείς ὡς ἄνθρωπος, οὐκ ἀπελείφθη τῆς θεότητος—

of the Atonement will hereafter require our more particular attention; the crucifixion, death, and burial have been already^e mentioned in several of the preceding extracts, and will also be found in some of those given under the next two Articles.

“For this cause the Lord endured to give his body to destruction, that we might be sanctified by the remission of sins, which is by the sprinkling of his blood:—The Lord endured to suffer for our souls, though he is the Lord of the world; to whom God said before the constitution of the world, ‘Let us make man^f.’” And again, “If, then, the Son of God, being Lord, and about to judge the quick and the dead, suffered that his stripes might give us life, we will believe that the Son of God could not suffer, except for our sakes^g.”

“As one of the least among you I wish to forewarn you, that ye fall not into the snares of false doctrine, but that ye be fully instructed in the birth, and suffering, and resurrection (which came to pass in the time of the government of Pontius Pilate) which were truly and assuredly accomplished by Jesus Christ, our hope; from which God forbid that any of you be turned aside^h.”

^e IGNAT. ante, p. 55. JUSTIN, p. 57. IRENÆUS, p. 58. CLEMENS ALEX. p. 59. TERTULL. p. 59—61. PETRUS. ALEX. p. 63.

^f BARNABÆ *Epist.* c. 5. —Dominus sustinuit pati pro animâ nostrâ, cum sit orbis terrarum Dominus.—

^g Idem *ibid.* c. 7.—Εἰ οὖν ὁ Υἱὸς τοῦ Θεοῦ, ὢν Κύριος, καὶ μέλων κρίνειν ζῶντας καὶ νεκροὺς, ἔπαθεν, ἵνα ἡ πληγὴ αὐτοῦ ζωοποιήσῃ ἡμᾶς, πιστεύσομεν, ὅτι ὁ Υἱὸς τοῦ Θεοῦ οὐκ ἠδύνατο παθεῖν, εἰ μὴ διὰ ἡμᾶς.

^h IGNAT. *ad Magnes.* s. 11. —ἀλλὰ πεπληροφορησθαι ἐν τῇ

“Stop your ears, therefore, as often as any one shall speak to you contrary to Jesus Christ; who was of the race of David, of the Virgin Mary; who was truly born, and did eat and drink; was truly persecuted under Pontius Pilate; was truly crucified and dead; both those in heaven, and on earth, and under the earth, beholding it. Who was also truly raised from the dead, his Father raising him, after the same manner as his Father will also raise up us who believe in him by Jesus Christ, without whom we have not the true lifeⁱ.”

“I glorify God, even Jesus Christ, who has given you such wisdom, for I have observed that you are settled in an immoveable faith, as if you were nailed to the Cross of our Lord Jesus, both in the flesh and in the spirit, and are confirmed in charity in the blood of Christ, being fully persuaded *of those things which relate* unto our Lord. Who truly was of the race of David according to the flesh, but the Son of God according to the will and power of God; truly born of the Virgin, and baptized of John, that all righteousness might be fulfilled by him; truly nailed to the cross, under Pontius Pilate and Herod the tetrarch, for us, in the flesh; by the fruits of which we are, even by his blessed passion; that he might set up a token for all ages, through his resurrection, to his holy

γενήσῃ, καὶ τῷ πάθει, καὶ τῇ ἀνασ-
τάσει—πραχθέντα ἀληθῶς καὶ
βεβαίως ὑπὸ Ἰησοῦ Χριστοῦ τῆς
ἐλπίδος ἡμῶν—

ⁱ IGNAT. *ad Trall.* s. 9.—
ὁς ἀληθῶς ἐσταυρώθη καὶ ἀπέθαν-
εν.—

and faithful servants, whether amongst the Jews or amongst the Gentiles, in one body of his church.

“Now all these things he suffered for us that we might be saved. And he truly suffered, as he also truly raised up himself. And not, as some unbelievers say, that he seemed to suffer, they themselves only seeming to be. And as they think, so shall it happen unto them, when being without bodies and mere spirits.

“But I know that, even after his resurrection, he was in the flesh, and I believe that he is still so. And when he came to those who were with Peter, he said unto them ‘take, handle me, and see that I am not an incorporeal spirit,’ and straightway they touched him and believed, being convinced both by his flesh and spirit. For this cause they despised death, and were found to be above death. But after his resurrection he did eat and drink with them, as in the flesh, although as to his spirit he was united to the Father^k.”

Justin Martyr, having insisted that the Jews knew neither the Father nor the Son, and ignorantly supposed that it was God the Father who spoke to Moses, whereas it was the Son, continues: “And formerly he appeared to Moses and to the other prophets in the form of fire and an incorporeal image; and now in the time of your empire, becoming man by a virgin, according to the

^k Idem *ad Smyrn.* s. 1, 2, 3.
 ——— Ἀληθῶς ἐπὶ Ποντίου Πιλάτου
 καὶ Ἡρώδου τετραράρχου καθήλω-
 μένον ὑπὲρ ἡμῶν ἐν σαρκί. s. 2.

—Ταῦτα γὰρ πάντα ἔπαθεν δι’
 ἡμᾶς ἵνα σωθῶμεν. Καὶ ἀληθῶς
 ἔπαθεν, ὡς καὶ ἀληθῶς ἀνέστησεν
 ἑαυτὸν——

will of the Father, he endured to be despised and to suffer, for the salvation of those who believe in him¹."

And again,

"If therefore the Father of all things willed that his own Christ, above all mortals, should bear the curse of all, knowing that he would raise him up when he was crucified and dead, why should you account him accursed who endured to suffer these things according to the will of the Father, and not rather bewail yourselves? For although his Father and himself brought it to pass that he should suffer these things for mankind, you did not this in order that you might obey the commandment of God^m."

Irenæus in one passage before quotedⁿ, speaks of the 'suffering' of Christ, and in another^o calls him 'the Saviour of those who are saved;' and in the following he speaks of the remission of sins: "Jesus, therefore, by remitting sins cured men, and manifestly shewed himself who he was. For if no one can remit sins except God alone, but the Lord remitted these, and cured men; it is plain that he was the Word of God, being made the Son of man, receiving from the Father the power of the remission of sins, that he was man,

¹ JUSTIN. *Apol.* 1^a. c. 63.
—ὑπὲρ σωτηρίας τῶν πιστευ-
οντων αὐτῷ καὶ ἐξουθενηθῆναι καὶ
παθεῖν ὑπέμεινεν.

^m JUSTIN. *Dial.* c. 95.—
Εἰ γὰρ καὶ ὁ Πατὴρ αὐτοῦ καὶ αὐτὸς

παθεῖν ταῦτα αὐτὸν ὑπὲρ τοῦ ἀνθρω-
πίου γενῶνς ἠντηγάσεν, ὑμεῖς οὐχ
ὥς γνώμη Θεοῦ ὑπηρετοῦντες τοῦτο
ἐπραξάτε.

ⁿ Art. I. p. 21.

^o Art. II. p. 53.

and that he was God; that as he suffered with us as man, he had compassion upon us as God^p.”

Clemens Alexandrinus says that Jesus Christ was adorned with good will, “because he alone gave himself a sacrifice for us^q.”

In a passage quoted above^r from Hippolytus, we see that he says the Jews “killed the Son of their Benefactor:” in the following passage he speaks of Christ’s suffering, and why he suffered: “The God of the universe became man for this cause, that by suffering in passible flesh he might redeem our whole race, which was sold unto death; and by working miracles through the flesh by his divine nature, which was impassible, he might bring us to his own unmixed and blessed life^s.”

And Cyprian, “He became mortal, that we might be immortal; and he by whom all things are governed, endured the final consequence of humanity^t.”

^p IRENÆI l. v. c. 17. s. 3.
—ut quomodo homo compassus
est nobis, tanquam Deus mis-
ereatur nostri.

^q CLEM. ALEX. *Pædag.* l.
i. c. 11.—ὅτι μόνος ὑπὲρ ἡμῶν
μέρεϊον ἑαυτὸν ἐπιδέδωκεν——

^r Ante p. 43.

^s HIPPOLYTI c. *Beron. et*

Helic. c. 2. v. 1. p. 227.—

ἵνα σαρκὶ μὲν παθητῇ πάσχων
ἅπαν ἡμῶν τὸ τῷ θανάτῳ πραθὲν
λυτρώσῃται γένος——

^t CYPRIANI *de Laude Mar-*
tyr. s. 4.—humanæ sortis exi-
tum pertulit per quem reguntur
humana.

ARTICLE III.

Of the going down of Christ into Hell.

“As Christ died for us, and was buried; so also is it to be believed, that he went down into Hell.”

This Article asserts the descent of Christ into hell, as distinct from his burial, which is contained in the preceding Article. It has generally been supposed that the descent into hell was not inserted in the more ancient creeds or rules of faith. But though no very early creed has come down to us, containing such an Article, yet there is good reason for supposing that it must have been somewhere expressed. Bishop Pearson, and others, have quoted Ruffinus as the first writer that mentions it as forming part of any creed. Ruffinus's account must be examined immediately, but there are two of the Fathers prior to him, who make mention of the doctrine, as if it were generally received. These two are Cyril of Jerusalem ^a, and Epi-

^a In the first instance I had followed the beaten path, acknowledging Ruffinus as the first author who makes particular mention of this doctrine. I have to thank the Rev. W.

F. Hook, for directing my attention to the passages quoted from Cyril and Epiphanius. At the same time I hope he will permit me to express my gratitude to him for many other

phanus. Cyril, who treats of each Article of the creed, says, "As man, Christ was truly placed in a sepulchre of a rock, but the rocks were rent in twain through terror on account of him. He descended to the lower parts of the earth, that he might redeem the righteous from thence^b." And Epiphanius says of Christ, "that his body was buried in truth, and remained three days without a soul, and breath, and motion, and was wrapped in fine linen, and deposited in the tomb, enclosed by means of a stone, with seals placed upon it; but his divine nature was not enclosed, or buried with it, but descended with his holy soul to the lower parts of the earth, and brought from thence the souls that were in captivity^c."

Ruffinus^d tells us that in his time it was neither in the Roman nor the Oriental creeds; but it was afterwards added to the Apostles' creed, the Roman, and others.

When Ruffinus first quotes this article of the creed of the church of Aquileia, he omits the word "buried" and gives it thus^e "crucifixus sub Pontio Pilato, descendit in inferna," and afterwards he says

kind and useful suggestions, of which I have availed myself, without particular acknowledgment, in other parts of the work.

^b CYRIL. *Hieros. Catech.* iv. Ἐν μνήματι πέτρας ἐτίθη ἀληθῶς, ὡς ἄνθρωπος, ἀλλὰ πέτραι διεῖράγησαν τῷ φόβῳ δι' αὐτόν. κατήλθεν εἰς τὰ καταχθόνια, ἵνα κἀκεῖθεν λυτρωσῇται τοὺς δικαίους.

^c EPIPHAN. *adv. Hæres.* i.

iii. tom. 2. *Compend. Fid. Cathol.* s. 17.—Τοῦ σώματος ταφέντος ἐν ἀληθείᾳ, καὶ ἀψύχου μέναντος τὸ τρίήμερον——οὐχὶ τῆς θεότητος συγκλείσθαισης, οὐ τῆς θεότητος ταφείσης, συγκατέλθούσης δὲ τῇ ψυχῇ τῇ ἀγίᾳ εἰς τὰ καταχθόνια, ἐλούσης ἐκεῖθεν τὴν τῶν ψυχῶν αἰχμαλωσίαν.

^d *Expos. Symb.* s. 20.

^e *Ibid.* s. 16.

that the force of the words “descendit in inferna”, seems in the Roman creed to be contained in the word “sepultus.” If therefore the above is the original reading of the creed of Aquileia it seems extremely probable that the descent *in inferna* was contained in that creed from the earliest times, possibly meaning something more than “burial,” though occupying the same place that “burial” did in other creeds. It must be observed, however, that the word *sepultus* also is in the Aquileian creed, and is given by Ruffinus as part of the creed expounded; so in Bingham it is thus “sepultus *et* descendit ad inferna.” Unless therefore we come to the conclusion that “sepultus” was inserted in the time of Ruffinus, it seems difficult to reconcile what he has said of its taking the place of the descent *in inferna* in other creeds, with the only version of the creed of Aquileia now extant.

And even in this creed the words *descendit ad inferna*, were not understood by all to assert the descent into hell, some translating the expression to mean “*hell*,” others “*the lower* parts of the earth: the former referring to St. Peter’s application of the prophecy, “Thou wilt not leave my soul in hell^f,” to Christ; the latter to the words of St. Paul, “He descended into the lower parts of the earth.”

But whether or not we may conclude, on the authority of Cyril and Epiphanius, that the descent into hell did form a part of the creeds used in the earlier churches, it is very clear, that the doctrine

^f Acts, c. ii. v. 27.

was admitted by the earliest Christians. There were several Articles of faith, which are now in our creeds, that were not in the earliest confessions, but which were nevertheless unquestionably received in the earliest times, and which will be seen under the eighth Article, when we come to give some account of the several creeds.

It is generally admitted by those who have written on our Articles, that our Church receives the doctrine expressed in this Article as contained in the Scriptures, leaving all its members to attach what meaning they conscientiously believe the words themselves may bear. In the Articles published in Edward the sixth's reign, the following words were added, "that the body of Christ lay in the grave until his resurrection, but his Spirit which he gave up, was with the Spirits which were detained in prison, or in hell, and preached to them, as the place in St. Peter testifieth^g." These words put a determinate sense on the Article; and their subsequent omission evidently shews that it was intended to leave the matter open to various constructions, as not being expressly decided by Scripture.

It seems scarcely necessary to mention the different ways in which the fact of the descent into hell, undoubtedly deduced from Scripture, and admitted by Christians of every denomination, has been interpreted and understood; bishops Pearson and Burnet have given them at some length. Nor do I consider it at all incumbent on me to

^g 1 Pet. c. iii. v. 19.

support any particular view, but shall content myself with shewing by a few extracts from the earlier Fathers, that as "Christ died for us and was buried," so also they believed, "that he went down into hell." It will appear, that though they differed as to the persons to whom and the end for which he descended, they all agree that he did descend.

Irenæus speaks of the soul of Christ going to the place where the souls of the dead were, and afterwards rising with his body; the soul and body being certainly separated, and the former going to another place, while the body was laid in the grave.

"Since our Lord departed into the middle of the shadow of death, where the souls of the dead were, and then rose again with his body, and after his resurrection was taken up into heaven; it is manifest that the souls of his disciples, for whom also the Lord underwent these things, will depart into an invisible place appointed for them by God, and will there dwell until the resurrection, waiting for the resurrection; and then taking back their bodies, and perfectly rising again, that is, with their bodies, as also the Lord rose, so they will thus come into the presence of God^h."

And Clemens Alexandrinus was so clearly of opinion that Christ descended into hell, that he says he went there to preach salvation to the souls

^h IRENÆI l. v. c. 31. s. 2.
Cum enim Dominus in medio
umbræ mortis abierit, ubi ani-

mæ mortuorum erant, post de-
inde corporaliter resurrexit—
manifestum est, etc.

in hell :—“ If then our Lord went down into hell for no other purpose than to preach the Gospel, he therefore went down to preach to all, or to the Jews only ⁱ.”

Tertullian mentions the descent into hell as distinct from burial ; having observed that Christians believe hell to be a vast space in the bowels of the earth, he continues ; “ If Christ, who is God, because he was also Man, having died according to the Scriptures, and being buried according to them, satisfied this law also, and underwent the form of human death in hell, and did not ascend to the higher parts of heaven, before he had descended into the lower parts of the earth, that he might there make himself known to the Patriarchs and Prophets ; you have reason for believing in the subterraneous region of hell, and for refuting those who proudly enough think that the souls of the faithful are not deserving of hell ^k.”

And Origen, speaking of Christ says, that “ with his soul naked of his body he went amongst the souls that were naked of their bodies ^l.” And in his exposition of the following verse in the 69th Psalm, “ I sink in deep mire, where there is no standing : I am come into deep waters, where the

ⁱ CLEM. ALEX. *Strom.* l. vi. c. 6. Εἰ μὲν οὖν ὁ Κύριος δι' οὐδὲν ἕτερον εἰς ᾧδου κατήλθεν, ἢ διὰ τὸ εὐαγγελίσασθαι, ὥσπερ κατήλθεν, ἥτοι πάντας εὐαγγελίσασθαι, ἢ μόνους Ἑβραίους.

^k TERTULL. *de Animâ.* c. 55. Quod si Christus, Deus, quia et homo, mortuus secun-

dum scripturas, et sepultus secus easdem, huic quoque legi satisfecit, formâ humanæ mortis apud inferos functus.—

^l ORIGEN. c. *Cels.* l. ii. s. 43. Γυμνῷ σώματος γενόμενος ψυχῇ, ταῖς γυμναῖς σωμάτων ὁμίλει ψυχαῖς,

floods overflow me ;” he says “ God himself, the Word, sends forth a prayer to his Father, making those sufferings his own, which belong to the human nature he assumed ; and he shews the region of hell, whither he alone descended and passed through ^m.”

ARTICLE IV.

Of the Resurrection of Christ.

“ CHRIST did truly rise again from death, and took again
 “ his body, with flesh, bones, and all things appertaining
 “ to the perfection of man’s nature, wherewith he ascended
 “ into heaven, and there sitteth until he return to judge
 “ all men at the last day.”

This Article asserts four things, first the resurrection of Christ, secondly his ascension in the flesh, thirdly his session, and lastly his second coming to judge the world.

The Docetæ and Apellæans, towards the latter end of the second century, and the Manichæans in the third, and indeed all who are called Allegorists, denied the reality of Christ’s resurrection, and consequently of his ascension in the flesh ; the second Council of Nice in the year 787, as the preceding Council at Constantinople had done, condemned the notion that Christ ascended into heaven with flesh and bones ; but the subjoined extracts will

^m Idem, in *Ps.* lxxviii. vol. ii. p. 755. — Δηλὸν δὲ τὰ τοῦ αἵματος αὐτοῦ χωρία ἐνθα καταβάς διεξῆλθεν.

sufficiently shew that the primitive Christians had no doubts on these points.

First then “*Christ did truly rise again from death and took again his body, etc.*”

Clemens of Rome says, “Let us consider, beloved, how the Lord continually sheweth us that there shall be a future resurrection; of which he has made our Lord Jesus Christ the first fruits, having raised him from the dead^a.”

And Ignatius, speaking of Christ, and arguing with the Docetæ, says, “For I know and do believe that he was in the flesh after his resurrection. And when he came to those who were with Peter, he said unto them, take, handle me, and see that I am not a spirit; and immediately they touched him and believed, being convinced by his flesh and the Spirit.—And after his resurrection he eat and drank with them as one in the flesh, although in his Spirit he was united with the Father^b.”

“The Lord remained on the Cross, almost until the evening, and about evening they buried him; afterwards he arose again the third day^c.”

“But upon Sunday we commonly all meet together: since that was the first day in which God, having turned over the darkness and matter, made the world; and Jesus Christ our Saviour on the

^a CLEM. ROM. *ad Corinth.* s. 24. Κατανοήσωμεν, ἀγαπητοί, πῶς ὁ θεὸς πότῃς ἐπιδείκνυται διηλεκτῶς ἡμῖν τὴν μέλλονσαν ἀνάστασιν ἵεσθαι, ἥς τὴν ἀπαρχὴν ἐποιήσατο τὸν Κύριον Ἰησοῦν Χριστόν, ἐκ νεκρῶν ἀναστήσας.

^b IGNAT. *ad Smyrn.* s. 3. Ἐγὼ γὰρ μετὰ τὴν ἀνάστασιν ἐν σαρκὶ αὐτὸν οἶδα καὶ πιστεύω ὄντα.—

^c JUSTIN. *Dial.* c. 97. — εἴτα ἀνέστη τῇ τρίτῃ ἡμέρᾳ.

same day arose from the dead. For the day before Saturday they crucified him, and the day after Saturday, which is Sunday, appearing to his apostles and disciples he taught them those things which we, for your understanding, also deliver unto you^d.”

Tertullian also in answer to Marcion, who denied the reality of the human nature in Christ, says, “He suffered nothing at all, if he did not truly suffer. But a spirit could not truly suffer. The whole work of God is therefore overthrown. The whole both weight and fruit of the name of Christian, that is to say, the death of Christ is denied, which the Apostle so forcibly insists upon as true, making it the chief foundation of the Gospel, and of our salvation, and his own preaching. ‘For,’ he says^e, ‘I have delivered unto you first of all, that Christ died for our sins, and that he was buried, and that he rose again on the third day.’ Moreover, if his flesh is denied, how is his death asserted, which is a suffering peculiar to flesh, that returns by death into the earth, from which it was taken, according to the law of its Maker? But the reality of his death being denied, by the denial of his flesh, neither can his resurrection be established. For by the same reason that he died not, neither did he rise again; that is to say not having the substance of flesh, of which as there

^d Idem. *Apol.* 1^a. c. 67. —

καὶ Ἰησοῦς Χριστὸς ὁ ἡμέτερος σωτὴρ
τῇ αὐτῇ ἡμέρᾳ ἐκ νεκρῶν ἀνίστη·
κ. τ. λ.

^e 1 Cor. xv. 3. 4.

is death, so also is there resurrection. Consequently if the resurrection of Christ is disproved, ours also is overthrown. For neither will that, for which Christ came, prevail, if Christ shall not prevail. For as those, who said that there is no resurrection of the dead, are convinced by the Apostle, from the resurrection of Christ; so if the resurrection of Christ does not stand, the resurrection of the dead is also taken away. And so, vain is our faith, vain is the preaching of the Apostles. And besides they are found to be false witnesses of God, inasmuch as they vouch as a testimony, that he has raised up Christ, whom he has not raised. And we are still in our sins^f."

And again he refers to the same proof that Ignatius has done, in the passage given above;

"As to the truth of his rising again with his body, what can be clearer? since he said to his disciples, who doubted whether he were not a Spirit, yea believed him to be a Spirit, 'Why are ye troubled, why do thoughts arise in your hearts?' Behold my hands and my feet, that it is I myself: handle me and see; for a spirit hath not flesh and bones, as ye see me have^h."

Origen also says,

"But we are far from saying that Christ appeared

^f TERTULL. *adv. Marcion.*
l. iii. c. 8. —Nam sicut illi,
qui dicebant resurrectionem
mortuorum non esse, revincun-
tur ab Apostolo, ex resurrec-
tione Christi: ita resurrectione
Christi non consistente, aufer-
tur et mortuorum resurrectio.—

^g Luke xxiv. 38. 39.

^h TERTULL. *adv. Marcion.*
l. iv. s. 43. De corporis autem
veritate quid potest clarius;
cum hæsitantibus eis ne phan-
tasma esset, imo phantasma
credentibus: *quid turbati
estis? inquit, etc.*

to suffer, lest his resurrection, which is true, should appear to be false; for he that truly died, if he rose again, did truly rise again; but if he only seemed to die, he did not truly rise againⁱ.”

And Novatian, proving the divinity of Christ, and having quoted Col. ii. 15, says, “It was therefore the Word of God who put off his flesh, and put it on again at his resurrection. But he put it off, since he had also put it on at his nativity. It is therefore God in Christ who is clothed, and he must also be divested^k.”

The resurrection of Christ is also mentioned in nearly all the passages quoted in support of the second point contained in this Article; viz.

Secondly, “*The Ascension in the Flesh.*”

In the creed from Irenæus which is inserted at length under the first Article^l, and which he represents as received by the whole Church, we find that they believed “in the resurrection from the dead, and the ascension in the flesh into heaven of the beloved Christ Jesus our Lord, and his coming from heaven in the glory of the Father to sum up all things, and to raise up all the flesh of all mankind^m.”

ⁱ ORIGEN. c. *Cels.* l. ii. c. 16. ‘ΑΛΛ’ ἡμεῖς τὸ δοκεῖν ἐπὶ τοῦ παθεῖν οὐ τάσσομεν, ἵνα μὴ ψευδῆς αὐτοῦ καὶ ἡ ἀνάστασις ᾗ, ἀλλ’ ἀληθὴς ὁ γὰρ ἀληθῶς ἀποθανὼν, εἰ ἀνέστη, ἀληθῶς ἀνέστη.—

^k NOVAT. de *Trinitat.* c. xvi. Sermo Dei fuit, qui exutus est carnem et in resurrectione rursus indutus.—

^l Ante p. 21.

^m IRENÆI l. i. c. 10. s. 1. —καὶ τὴν ἔγερσιν ἐκ νεκρῶν, καὶ τὴν ἔνσαρκον εἰς τοὺς οὐρανοὺς ἀνάληψιν τοῦ ἡγαπημένου Χριστοῦ Ἰησοῦ τοῦ Κυρίου ἡμῶν, καὶ τὴν ἐκ τῶν οὐρανῶν ἐν τῇ δόξῃ τοῦ Πατρὸς παρουσίαν αὐτοῦ, ἐπὶ τὸ ἀνακεφαλαιώσασθαι τὰ πάντα, καὶ ἀναστήσαι πᾶσαν σάρκα πάσης ἀνθρωπότητος.—

Tertullian, in answer to those who denied the reality of Christ's suffering, and who said that Christ was different from Jesus, having alluded to the second Epistle of St. John, and said 'Whosoever does not confess that Christ is come in the flesh, he is Antichristⁿ,' thus sums up his argument, "It is well declared that the same will come from heaven who suffered: the same will appear to all, who has been raised up^o: and 'they who pierced him shall see and acknowledge him^p;' that is to say, the very flesh against which they raged; without which he can neither be, nor be acknowledged. Let them therefore be ashamed who affirm that the flesh sitteth in heaven devoid of feeling, like a sheath with Christ taken out of it^q."

And the following creed touches on all the points expressed in the present Article; it is inserted at length, with a view to a question that will arise under the sixth Article.—"The rule of faith is—that there is only one God, and no other besides the Creator of the world, who made all things of nothing, by his Word which was first of all sent forth; that that Word, called his Son, was seen at various times by the Patriarchs under the name of God, was always heard in the Prophets; lastly, was brought down by the spirit and virtue of God the Father to the Virgin Mary, was made flesh,

ⁿ 2 John 7.

^o Apparently in reference to Acts i. 11.

^p Rev. x. 1—7.

^q TERTULL. *de Carne Christi*, c. 24. —utique ipsam

carnem inquam scævierunt; sine quâ nec ipse esse poterit, nec agnoscî: ut et illi erubescant qui adfirmant carnem in cœlis vacuum sensu, ut vaginam ex-empto Christo sedere.

and that from her he was born a man, and is Jesus Christ; that after that he had preached a new law, and a new promise of the kingdom of heaven; he had worked miracles; was fixed to the cross; had risen again on the third day; carried up into heaven, he sits on the right hand of the Father; had sent the substituted power of the Holy Ghost to guide those that believe; that he will come with glory to take the saints to the enjoyment of life eternal and the heavenly promises, and to adjudge the wicked to everlasting fire, raising up both of them with the resurrection of the flesh^r.”

Hippolytus evidently refers Psalm xxiv. 7. to Christ, when he says, “He comes to the heavenly gates; angels accompanying him; and the gates of heaven are closed; for he is not yet ascended into heaven. He is now the first who appears to the heavenly powers a fleshly body ascending. It is said therefore to these powers by the angels who were before the Saviour and Lord, ‘Lift up your gates, ye rulers, and be ye lift up, ye everlasting doors, and the King of Glory shall come in^s.’”

And Cyprian very briefly and decidedly expresses himself; after Christ had spent forty days with his disciples, he says, “He was then taken up to heaven, a cloud being spread about him, that the

^r TERTULL. *de Præscript. Hæret.* c. 13.—*tertiâ die resurrexisse; in cœlos ereptum, sedere ad dexteram Patris;—venturum cum claritate, ad sumendos sanctos in vitæ æternæ et promissorum cœlestium fructum, et ad prophanos adjudi-*

candos igni perpetuo, factâ utriusque partis resuscitatione cum carnis restitutione.

^s HIPPOLYTI *Fragmentum in Ps. xxiv. 7.* vol. i. p. 268.—*Πρῶτος νῦν φαίνεται ταῖς δυνάμεσι ταῖς οὐρανίας σὰρξ ἀναβαίνουσα.—*

human nature, which he loved, which he put on, which he protected from death, he might triumphantly carry to his Father; hereafter about to come from heaven for the punishment of the devil, and the judgment of mankind, with the vigour of an avenger, and the power of a judge^t.”

Thirdly, the Article asserts the session of Christ in heaven. We may begin with Justin, who says; “ But that the Father of all was to bring Christ to heaven, after having raised him from the dead, and to retain him there until he should tread under foot the spirits that were hateful to him, and the number of the good and virtuous people, that were foreknown to him, was accomplished, for whose sakes also the final destruction of all things by him is yet delayed; hear the words of the prophet David^u; ‘ The Lord said unto my Lord, Sit thou on my right hand until I make thine enemies thy footstool^x. ’ ”

Tertullian, in a creed before given, as well as in two others, mentions Christ’s session on the right hand of the Father; “ We believe—that he died and was buried according to the Scriptures; that he was raised again by the Father, and taken up into heaven, and sitteth on the right hand of the

^t CYPRIAN. *de Idol. Vanitate*, s. 8. Tunc in cælum circumfusâ nube sublatuſ est, ut hominem, quem dilexit, quem induit, quem à morte protexit, ad Patrem Victor imponeret.

^u Ps. cx. 1.

^x JUSTIN. *Apol.* 1^a. c. 45.

*Οτι δὲ ἀγαγεῖν τὸν Χριστὸν εἰς τὸν οὐρανὸν ὁ Πατὴρ τῶν πάντων Θεὸς μετὰ τὸ ἀναστήσαι ἐκ νεκρῶν αὐτὸν ἔμελλε, καὶ κατέχειν ἕως ἂν πατάξῃ τοὺς ἐχθραίνοντας αὐτῷ δαίμονας—

Father; and that he will come to judge the quick and the dead^y." And in the other, "that on the third day he rose again from the dead, was taken up into heaven, and now sitteth on the right hand of the Father, and that he will come to judge the quick and the dead^z".

And Hippolytus says, "We truly acknowledge one God; we acknowledge Christ; we acknowledge the Son who suffered, as he suffered, who died as he died, and rose again on the third day, and is on the right hand of the Father, and cometh to judge the quick and dead^a."

Fourthly, "*Christ will judge all men at the last day.*"

Barnabas in several places speaks of Christ's second coming to judge the world: "He, that he might abolish death, and might shew the resurrection of the dead, because it behoved him to appear in the flesh, was content to do so, that he might make good the promise given to our fathers; and preparing for himself a new people, might demonstrate to them, while he was upon the earth, that having himself caused the resurrection, he would judge *the world*^b."

^y TERTULL. *adv. Prax.* c. 2. —et in cœlos resumptum, sedere ad dextram Patris, venturum judicare vivos et mortuos.

^z Idem, *de Virg. Veland.* c. 1. —sedentem nunc ad dextram Patris, venturum judicare vivos et mortuos.

^a HIPPOLYTI c. *Noet.* c. 1. vol. ii. p. 6.—καὶ ἔντα ἐν δεξιᾷ τοῦ Πατρὸς, καὶ ἐρχόμενον κρῖναι ζῶντας καὶ νεκρούς.

^b BARNABÆ *Epist.* c. 5. —ἐπεδείξῃ, ἐπὶ τῆς γῆς ὧν, ὅτι ἀνάστασιν αὐτὸς ποιήσας κρινεῖ.

And in another place, “ If, then, the Son of God, being Lord, and about to judge the quick and the dead, hath suffered, that his stripes might give us life, we must believe that the Son of God could not have suffered, except on our account ^c. ”

Justin also alludes to Christ's second coming ; having in his Dialogue with Tryphon asserted the divinity of Jesus Christ, and referred to various distinct allusions to him in the Old Testament, he adds, “ If you had known this, you would not have spoken blasphemies against him who is already come, and has been born, and has suffered, and ascended into heaven ; who will also come again, and then your twelve tribes will mourn ^d. ”

And Origen ; “ But since he often calls ours a hidden doctrine, in this also he must be convicted of falsehood : for almost the whole world is better acquainted with the things that are declared by Christians than with the tenets of the philosophers. For who is ignorant of the generation of Jesus from the Virgin, and that he was crucified, and of his resurrection which so many believe, and as is declared that he will come to judge the world, punishing sinners according to their deserts, and conferring rewards upon the righteous ^e ? ”

^c Idem, *ibid.* c. 7.—μέλλων κρίνειν ζῶντας καὶ νεκρούς—

^d JUSTIN. *Dial. cum Tryph.* c. 126.—ὁ καὶ πάλιν παρέσται—

^e ORIGEN. c. *Cels.* lib. iii. c. 7.—τίνα γὰρ λανθάνει ἢ ἐκ παρ-

θένου γέννησις Ἰησοῦ, καὶ ὁ ἐσταυρωμένος, καὶ ἡ παρὰ πολλοῖς πεπιστευμένη ἀνάστασις αὐτοῦ, καὶ ἡ καταγελλομένη κρίσις, κολάζουσα μὲν κατ' ἀξίαν τοὺς ἁμαρτάνοντας, γέρωσ δ' ἀξιοῦσα τοὺς δικαίους ;

ARTICLE V.

Of the Holy Ghost.

“THE Holy Ghost proceeding from the Father and the Son, is of one substance, majesty, and glory, with the Father and the Son, very and eternal God.”

The first Article asserted the personality and divinity of the Holy Ghost; the only addition therefore that seems to be made in this Article, is the procession from the Father and the Son. But as the extracts before given are chiefly intended to illustrate the doctrine of the Trinity, it may be as well to adduce a few more passages in proof of the distinct personality, and of the divinity of the Holy Ghost.

It has been already observed^a that some of the earlier dissenters from the Catholic doctrine (as the Socinians still do) denied that the Holy Ghost is a Person, but called it an energy, emanation, or operation. Prior however to the Nicene Council there was no separate discussion on this point; the chief differences were concerning the second person of the Trinity, and consequently we find that in treatises composed, (as was Novatian's for instance,) expressly in support of the doctrine of the Trinity, very little is said of the third

^a Art. i. p. 13.

Person, and for this obvious reason, that if the divinity of the Son, and his Unity with the Father could not be proved from Scripture, the whole doctrine must fall to the ground. The correctness of this remark may be seen from the fact that the Nicene creed, as first agreed upon and promulgated A. D. 325, ends with the words "and in the Holy Ghost," which would scarcely have happened if there had been at that time any serious differences of opinion respecting the divinity of the Holy Ghost.

Though some traces of a disbelief in the divinity of the Holy Ghost are to be found amongst those who were accused of heresy with regard to the Son, it was not until the fourth century that a sect arose professing such disbelief as its distinguishing mark.

Macedonius, patriarch of Constantinople, gave a name to such a sect, his followers were called Macedonians, or from their opinions Πνευματομάχοι. What their opinions were is not very clear, they professed to receive the whole of the Nicene creed, which at that time concluded with the words "and in the Holy Ghost." It is certain however that they denied the divinity of the Holy Ghost. Macedonius was deposed from his patriarchate in a Council held at Constantinople in the year 360.

The history of the additions subsequently made to the Nicene creed, and which were expressly directed against the Macedonian heresy, will more properly come under the eighth Article. But a few words must in this place be said of the proces-

sion from the Father and the Son. The origin of the disputes that broke out anew on this point is, as Mosheim observes, “covered with perplexity and doubt^b.”

The general Council held at Constantinople in the year 381, amongst other additions to the Nicene creed, inserted a declaration of the procession of the Holy Ghost “from the Father;” it was not until the end of the sixth century that the Western church inserted the words “and the Son;” but it is important to observe, that in the Councils of Alexandria and Ephesus, as early as the years 430 and 431, it was declared that the Holy Ghost proceeded from the Son as well as from the Father.

In the passages which I am able to adduce from the Anti-Nicene Fathers it must be confessed that very little is said of the procession of the Holy Ghost from the Father and the Son; but it must be borne in mind that controversy had not yet reached to this point; and that therefore the early Christians, though they continually mention both the divinity and personality of the Holy Ghost, do not express themselves so precisely as the Church was afterwards compelled to do. The doctrine itself is not in express words mentioned in the Scriptures, but is undoubtedly deduced from thence, and so we shall find some few passages in the Anti-Nicene Fathers from which we can collect that they held the same doctrine that our Church professes.

Justin Martyr in the following passage says that

^b Mosheim, vol. ii. Cent. viii. p. 2. c. 3. s. 15.

the Holy Ghost “spoke by the Prophets,” from which we cannot doubt of his belief in the divinity of the Holy Ghost; “He that is enlightened is washed in the name of God the Father and Lord of the universe:—and in the name of our Saviour Jesus Christ, who was crucified under Pontius Pilate, and in the name of the Holy Ghost, who declared by the Prophets all things that relate to Jesus^c.”

And in his Dialogue he says, “You must allow me in the first place to quote such prophecies as I please, to prove that Christ is called God and Lord of Hosts, and figuratively, Jacob by the Holy Ghost^d.” He then proceeds to comment on the 24th Psalm, shewing that it referred not to Solomon, but to Christ ascending into heaven and sitting on the right hand of the Father, “For when the officers in heaven saw him bearing an uncomely and undignified and inglorious form, they did not recognise him, and asked ‘Who is this, the King of Glory?’ and the Holy Ghost answers them, either in the person of the Father or in his own, ‘The Lord of Hosts himself, he is the King of Glory^e.’”

A remark of Justin’s own, which has been before made use of, may be again referred to, to shew that he considers the power of foretelling the future to

^c JUSTIN. *Apol.* 1^a. c. 61. —καὶ ἐπ’ ὀνόματος Πνεύματος Ἁγίου ὃ διὰ τῶν Προφητῶν προεκήρυξε τὰ κατὰ τὸν Ἰησοῦν πάντα, ὃ φωτίζόμενος λαύεται.

^d Idem, *Dial. cum Tryph.* c. 36. —καὶ Ἰακώβ καλεῖται ἐν

παραβολῇ ἐπὶ τοῦ Ἁγίου Πνεύματος.

^e Idem, *ibid.* —καὶ ἀποκρίνεται αὐτοῖς τὸ Πνεῦμα τὸ Ἅγιον ἢ ἀπὸ προσώπου τοῦ Πατρὸς, ἢ ἀπὸ τοῦ ἰδίου, Κύριος, κ. τ. λ.

be a proof of divinity; and consequently that he believed in the divinity of the Holy Ghost; "It is the work of God, to declare things before they happen^f."

And in the creed from Irenæus, which will be found at length under the first Article^g, it is expressed that the whole church believes "in the Holy Ghost, who declared by the Prophets the incarnation, and the coming, etc. of the beloved Christ Jesus our Lord."

In another place he says, that the Holy Ghost was with the Father before all creation, "That the Word, that is the Son, was always with the Father, I have already proved at much length: but that Wisdom also, which is the Spirit, was with him before all creation, he says in the words of Solomon^h." Irenæus then quotes Prov. iii. 19, 20, and viii. 22—27, which the Fathers constantly referred to the second and third persons of the Trinity. The procession from the Son may also be inferred from another extract from Irenæus given under the first Article, where he says "that the Spirit is in all of us, and he is the living water which the Lord supplies to those that believe rightly in him, and love him, etc."

From Tertullian, who was so much engaged in controversy, we may fairly expect stronger testimony to our creed, if it agrees with his; and ac-

^f See the whole passage ante p. 47.

^g Ante p. 21.

^h IRENÆI l. iv. c. 20. s. 3.

—Quoniam autem et Sapientia, quæ est Spiritus, erat apud eum ante omnem constitutionem, per Solomonem ait.

cordingly we shall find him using expressions that contain all that this Article declares. In the following passage he calls the Holy Ghost God: "Since we are all 'the temple of God', the Holy Ghost being placed within us and consecrated; modesty is the guardian and priestess of that temple, who permits nothing unclean or profane to be brought within it, lest that God, who dwells within, being offended at the pollution of his sanctuary, should leave it^k."

The next passage shews the procession of the Holy Ghost from the Father by the Son, and it will be difficult to explain how that differs from the procession from the Father *and* the Son:

"But when I derive the Son from nothing else than from the substance of the Father, and when I say that he does nothing without the will of the Father, and that he has obtained all power from the Father, how can I be said by this belief to destroy the monarchy, which is given by the Father to the Son, and is in the Son as a Servant? I would also use the same expressions to the third order, because I suppose the Spirit to be derived from no other source, than from the Father, by the Son^l."

ⁱ 1 Cor. iii. 16.

^k TERTULL. *de Cultu Fæminarum*, c. 1. Nam cum omnes *templum* Dei simus, illato in nos et consecrato Spiritu Sancto, ejus templi æditua et antistes pudicitia est, quæ nihil immundum nec

profanum inferri sinat, ne Deus ille, qui inhabitat, inquinatam sedem offensus derelinquat.

^l Idem, *adv. Prax.* c. 4.— Spiritum non aliunde puto, quam à Patre per Filium.

The following illustration of the mode of the procession, which was frequently made use of by the Fathers, however inadequate to the subject, will, nevertheless, shew very distinctly, perhaps too distinctly, Tertullian's belief in the procession of the Holy Ghost from the Father and the Son :

Having remarked that the Word is put forth from God, but that this putting forth (*προβαλῆ*) is very different from that which Valentinus speaks of, when he says that one æon produces another, Tertullian then insists on the unity and consubstantiality of the Father and the Son, and continues : “ This is the true sense of probola, and preserves the unity, so that in this sense we say that the Son was put forth from the Father, but is not separate from him. For God put forth the Word, as the root puts forth the shrub, and the fountain puts forth the river, and the sun puts forth the ray ; for those species are puttings forth of those substances, from which they proceed—the shrub is not distinct from the root, nor the river from the fountain, nor the ray from the sun, as neither is the Word from God.—According, therefore, to the form of these examples, I profess to speak of two beings, God and his Word, the Father and his Son. For the root and the shrub are two things, but united : and the fountain and the river are two species, but undivided : and the sun and the ray are two forms, but adhering together. Every thing that proceeds from another must necessarily be second with reference to that from which it proceeds, but it is not therefore separate. But

when there is a second there are two ; and when there is a third, there are three. For the Spirit is the third from God and his Son, as the fruit that comes from the shrub is third from the root : and the river which proceeds from the stream is third from the fountain : and the point which proceeds from the ray is third from the sun^m."

This method of illustration may be used to explain Tertullian's words in the passage next preceding : thus, when he says that the Spirit is derived "from the Father by the Son ;" he evidently means that the Holy Ghost proceeds from the Father *and* the Son, as "the fruit that comes from the shrub is third from the root ; and the river which proceeds from the stream is third from the fountain ;" in either case that which is third, proceeding from that which is second, and also from the first *by* that which is second, and so proceeding from both.

In a former passage of the same treatise Tertullian had said that Jesus Christ after his ascension "sent, according to his promise, the Holy Ghost, the Comforter, from the Father, to sanctify their faith, who believe in the Father, and the Son, and the Holy Ghostⁿ."

^m TERTULL. *adv. Prax.* c. 3.—Tertius enim est Spiritus à Deo, et Filio, sicut tertius à radice fructus ex frutice, et tertius à fonte rivus ex flumine, et tertius à sole apex ex radio.

ⁿ Idem, *ibid.* c. 2.—Qui ex-

inde miserit, secundum promissionem suam, à Patre Spiritum Sanctum, Paracletum, sanctificatorem fidei eorum, qui credunt in Patrem, et Filium, et Spiritum Sanctum.

The last extract that I shall adduce from Tertullian very plainly asserts the divinity of the Holy Ghost:

“He poured forth the Holy Ghost, the gift which he had received from the Father, the third who bears the divine name, the third in the order of majesty—who leads into all truth, which, according to the Christian mystery, is in the Father, and the Son, and the Holy Ghost.

“But it is a sort of Jewish creed, so to believe in one God, as that you refuse to reckon the Son, together with him, and after the Son, the Spirit. For what other difference is there but this between ourselves and them? what is the effect of the Gospel? what is the substance of the New Testament, which says that the Law and the Prophets were until John? unless after that, the Father, and the Son, and the Holy Ghost, who are believed to be three, make one God? So God chose to give a new sacrament, that this unity might be believed after a new manner, through the Son and the Holy Ghost, that God might now be openly known under his proper names and characters, who formerly also was preached by the Son and the Holy Ghost, but was not understood.”

Hippolytus speaks of the Holy Ghost as an ob-

° Idem, *ibid*, c. 30, 31. Hic interim acceptum à Patre munus effudit, Spiritum Sanctum, tertium nomen divinitatis et tertium gradum majestatis. —deductorem omnis veritatis, quæ est in Patre et Filio et

Spiritu Sancto, secundum Christianum sacramentum.—quæ est substantia Novi Testamenti—si non exinde Pater et Filius et Spiritus Sanctus, tres crediti, unum Deum sistunt?

ject of worship: "Thus we contemplate the incarnate Word; through him we form a conception of the Father; we believe in the Son; we worship the Holy Ghost^p."

Dionysius of Alexandria, in a passage given at length under the first Article^q, very strongly asserts the procession from the Father and the Son. "If I added the Holy Ghost, I at the same time subjoined both from whence and by whom he came^r."—And then, having insisted on the union of the Father and the Son, he adds: "In their hands also is the Spirit, which can neither be separated from the person sending, nor from the person conveying^s."

ARTICLE VI.

Of the Sufficiency of the Holy Scriptures for Salvation.

"HOLY Scripture containeth all things necessary to Salvation: so that whatsoever is not read therein, nor may be proved thereby, is not to be required of any man, that it should be believed as an Article of the Faith, or be thought requisite or necessary to Salvation. In the name of the holy Scripture we do understand those Canonical Books of the Old and New Testament, of whose authority was never any doubt in the Church."

^p HIPPOLYTI c. Noetum c. 12. p. 14.—Πνεύματι Ἁγίῳ προσκυνούμεν.

^q Ante p. 35, 36.

^r DIONYS. Alex. ex Elench. et Apol. p. 93. Ἁγίον Πνεῦμα

προσέθηκα, ἀλλ' ἅμα καὶ πόθεν καὶ διὰ τίνος ἦκεν ἐφήρμοσα.

^s Idem, ibid. Ἐν τε ταῖς χερσὶν αὐτῶν ἐστὶ τὸ Πνεῦμα, μήτε τοῦ πέμποντος, μήτε τοῦ φέροντος δυνάμενον στέρεσθαι.

“Of the Names and Number of the Canonical Books.

“Genesis.	The First Book of Chronicles.
“Exodus.	The Second Book of Chronicles.
“Leviticus.	The First Book of Esdras.
“Numbers.	The Second Book of Esdras.
“Deuteronomy.	The Book of Esther.
“Joshua.	The Book of Job.
“Judges.	The Psalms.
“Ruth.	The Proverbs.
“The First Book of Samuel.	Ecclesiastes, or Preacher.
“The Second Book of Samuel.	Cantica, or Songs of Solomon.
“The First Book of Kings.	Four Prophets the Greater.
“The Second Book of Kings.	Twelve Prophets the Less.

“And the other Books, (as Hierome saith,) the Church
 “doth read for example of life, and instruction of manners;
 “but yet it doth not apply them to establish any doctrine;
 “such are these following :

- “The Third Book of Esdras.
- “The Fourth Book of Esdras.
- “The Book of Tobias.
- “The Book of Judith.
- “The rest of the Book of Esther.
- “The Book of Wisdom.
- “Jesus the Son of Sirach.
- “Baruch the Prophet.
- “The Song of the Three Children.
- “The Story of Susanna.
- “Of Bel and the Dragon.
- “The Prayer of Manasses.
- “The First Book of Maccabees.
- “The Second Book of Maccabees.

“All the Books of the New Testament, as they are
 commonly received, we do receive, and account them
 Canonical.”

This Article begins by asserting positively that
 “Holy Scripture containeth all things necessary

to salvation;" and then negatively, "that whatsoever is not read therein, nor may be proved thereby," is not necessary to salvation.

This part of the Article may, however, be now considered as containing only one proposition, which is directed against the doctrine of traditions held by the Church of Rome. That Church maintains that the Scriptures are not sufficient without the (so-called) Apostolical traditions, which they declare to be of equal authority with the Scriptures. These traditions, they believe, have been faithfully handed down to the present time, and they affirm that an infallible authority is vested by Christ in his Church to distinguish those which are true from those which are false. The Council of Trent in its fourth session (April, 1546) settled their canon of Scripture, and mention traditions as a ground of their faith, pronouncing an anathema on those who do not receive their Scriptures according to the ancient Vulgate, and also their traditions.

It should be observed that there is no authorized collection of these traditions, though there are some doctrines of theirs, which can only be supported by them on this pretence.

The creed of Pope Pius the fourth, which was published A. D. 1564 in the form of a Papal Bull, and which Mr. Butler says contains "a succinct and explicit summary of the canons of the Council of Trent," is universally received as the true standard of the Romish faith; it therefore seems desirable, especially as its Articles are concise, to give such of them, under this, and the following

Articles of our Church, as we shall have occasion to notice.

The first twelve Articles of that Creed consists of the Nicene Creed; so much of the thirteenth as concerns our sixth Article is as follows; "I most firmly admit and embrace Apostolical and Ecclesiastical Traditions, and all other constitutions and observances of the same Church ^a."

The following extracts from the Fathers will satisfactorily shew, that they appealed to the Scriptures as alone sufficient to determine all controversies in matters of faith, and as a necessary consequence, that nothing, which may not be proved from Scriptural authority, is necessary for salvation.

But while we are putting down the authority of tradition, as independent of the word of God, we must be cautious not to lose sight of its value as the interpreter of Scripture. But inasmuch as it is better to have one only object in view, viz. that immediately arising out of the Article before us; the consideration of the question how far the authority of the primitive Church is binding on us, must be considered at more length in the preface. On this subject we are at issue with the whole body of Dissenters, and some of the Protestant Churches on the continent of Europe.

Irenæus says; "The Scriptures indeed are perfect, as being dictated by the Word of God and his Spirit ^b."

And again, "We following the one and sole true

^a Butler's Confession of Faith, p. 9.

^b IRENÆI l. ii. c. xxviii. s. 2. Scripturæ quidem perfectæ

God as our teacher, and having his words for the rule of truth, say always the same things concerning the same subjects^c.”

And Clemens of Alexandria; “We should not simply attend to the words of men, which it is as lawful for us to gainsay. But if it be not sufficient only to say what we think, but what is said ought to be confirmed, let us not wait for testimony from men, but let us confirm, what is questioned, by the voice of God, which is more certain than all demonstrations, or rather is itself the only demonstration^d.”

The writers of the Roman Church claim Tertullian as an authority in favour of their traditions, and as this Article is expressly directed against that Church, it may be necessary to enter at some length on the consideration of those passages of Tertullian which seem to uphold their opinions. It must be admitted, that a hasty perusal of some of this author's works may give an impression, that the Romanists have some reason in resorting to his authority, but on a little examination it will be found that he does not help them much.

If in any of Tertullian's writings we should expect to find the doctrine of Traditions strongly insisted on, it would be in that called “The Pre-

sunt, quippe à Verbo Dei et Spiritu ejus dictæ.

^c Idem, l. iv. c. xxxv. s. 4, Nos autem unum et solum verum Deum doctorem sequentes, et regulam veritatis habentes ejus sermones, de iisdem semper eadem dicimus omnes.

^d CLEM. ALEX. *Strom.* l. vii. c. 16.—ἀλλὰ τῇ τοῦ Κυριοῦ φωνῇ πιστούμεθα τὸ ζητούμενον, ἢ πασῶν ἀποδείξεων ἐχεγγωτέρα, μᾶλλον δὲ ἡ μόνῃ ἀποδείξει οὕσα τυγχάνει.

scriptions," or more properly, "Of Prescription against the Hereticks."

The very title shews that their opinions are to be combated on the ground of their novelty, and as opposed to that faith which had been handed down from the times of the Apostles.

His adversaries, the heretics, he says, offer to abide by the decision of the Scriptures, this he declines, not because they are insufficient for the purpose, or because there is any traditional doctrine beyond the Scriptures, but for reasons which will be given best in his own words.—

"That heresy does not receive certain Scriptures, and what it does receive, by adding and taking away, it perverts to support its own doctrine. If it does receive them, it does not receive them entire." He then shews that they pervert the meaning of those Scriptures which they do admit, and that therefore they must first agree, what are the Scriptures. "To whom does the rule of faith itself appertain? in whose keeping are the Scriptures? From whom, and through whom, and when, and to whom was delivered the discipline, by which Christians are made Christians? For where it shall appear that the truth of the Christian discipline and faith is, there will be the truth of the Scriptures, and of their meaning, and of all Christian traditions^f."

Thus far Tertullian does not seem to go beyond

^e TERTULL. *de Præscript. Hæret.* c. 17.—quas recipit, ad dispositionem instituti sui intervertit.—
adjectionibus et detractationibus ^f Ibid. c. 19.

our twentieth Article, which declares the Church to be “a witness and keeper of holy writ;” and to have authority in controversies of faith, so that however it does not ordain any thing contrary to God’s word.

But to proceed with Tertullian. He, in the following chapter^e, states that from those Churches which have been founded by the Apostles, all true Churches must be derived; and in the next chapter continues: “To this point therefore we direct prescription. If the Lord Jesus Christ sent the Apostles to preach, no other preachers are to be received than those whom Christ appointed; because no one knew the Father, but the Son, and he to whom the Son revealed Him; nor does the Son appear to have revealed the Father to any others than the Apostles, whom he sent to preach, viz. that which he revealed to them. But what they preached is that which Christ revealed to them; and here I prescribe, that doctrines ought not otherwise to be proved than by those same Churches which the Apostles themselves founded, having themselves preached to them; as well *vivâ voce* (as it is said) as afterwards by their Epistles. If this be so, it is consequently plain that all doctrine which agrees with those Churches that are apostolical, and the nurseries and originals of faith, is to be accounted true; without doubt containing what the Churches received from the Apostles, the Apostles from Christ, and Christ from God. But

^e Nearly the whole of this chapter will be found under the nineteenth Article.

every other doctrine is to be prejudged as false, which is contrary to the truth of the Churches, and Apostles, and Christ, and God. It remains, therefore, that we shew whether our doctrine, the rule of which we have given above, can be accounted to be of the tradition of the Apostles; and consequently, whether the rest come of falsehood. We communicate with the apostolic Churches, because there is no difference in our doctrine; this is a proof of its truth^f."

It will be important in this place to refer to the rule of faith to which Tertullian alludes. It will be found at length under the fourth Article^g.

Applying, therefore, his argument in favour of tradition, as far as he intended it should be carried, it amounts to this, that laying aside the Scriptures as the medium of proof, the question of heresy or not must be decided by an appeal to the doctrines received by the apostolic Churches: the rule of faith, or creed, which contained the true doctrine, and which only he had then to maintain, was that rule which the Church had received and adopted from the times of the Apostles. But the foregoing passage can by no means be adduced in support of traditions which are not supported by the authority of Scripture.

The twenty-third chapter of this book of Tertullian's may be quoted as an express authority against traditions. Some of the heretics rejected the book of the Acts of the Apostles, and yet en-

^f TERTULL. *de Præscript. Hæret.* c. 21.

^g Ante, p. 80.

IRA J. TAYLOR LIBRARY
THE ILIFF SCHOOL OF THEOLOGY
2233 SO. UNIVERSITY BLVD.
DENVER, COLORADO 80210

deavoured to shew that the Apostles were ignorant of some things, from the circumstance that St. Paul had found fault with St. Peter. To which Tertullian ingeniously remarks, “ then, if you reject the Acts of the Apostles, how do you know that St. Paul was an Apostle ?” and adds, “ But they will believe without the Scriptures, so that they may believe against the Scriptures^h.”

Further on Tertullian again says, “ If this be so, that the truth is adjudged to be with us, who observe that rule which the Church handed down from the Apostles, the Apostles from Christ, and Christ from God, the reason of my first position stands good, when I laid down that heretics are not to be allowed to appeal to the Scriptures, whom, without the Scriptures, we prove not to belong to the Scriptures at all ; for if they are heretics they cannot be Christiansⁱ.”

And again, “ Wherever a diversity in the doctrine is found, there it must be concluded that the Scriptures, and the expositions of Scripture, have been corrupted. They who purposed to teach otherwise must needs have made another disposition of those instruments whence the doctrine is to be derived. For they could not else teach any other doctrine, unless they had wherewithal to teach otherwise. As the corruption of the doctrine could not succeed with them without the corruption of the instruments of proof ; so with us also,

^h TERTULL. *de Præscript. Hæret.* c. 23. Sed credent sine Scripturis, ut credent adversus Scripturas.

ⁱ Ibid, c. 37.

the integrity of our doctrine could not be ascertained, without the integrity of those things by means of which the doctrine is arrived at. For what have we that is contrary to our Scriptures? what have we inserted of our own, so that we should remedy, by taking away, or adding, or changing any thing that can be discovered in it contrary to the Scriptures? What we are, that the Scriptures are from the first. We are from them, before there was any thing otherwise than we are^k."

This passage, obscure as it is, is sufficient to clear all doubts which the former may have raised. Scripture is referred to as the ultimate and only sure test.

Dupin, in his account of Tertullian's book *De Coronâ Militis*, says, "He speaks in this discourse very advantageously of custom and tradition, and relates several remarkable examples of ceremonies which he pretends to be derived from tradition." The use of the word "pretends," shews that Dupin, when he appealed to Tertullian's opinion in favour of his Church, was unwilling to admit his authority as establishing those very traditions which he cites. And it will be found that tradition here means nothing more than it does in our thirty-fourth Article.

Tertullian, in the book before us, is defending

* Idem ibid. c. 38. Illic igitur et Scripturarum et expositionum adulteratio deputanda est, ubi diversitas [invenitur] doctrinæ. Quibus fuit propositum aliter docendi, necessitas instituit, aliter disponendi instru-

menta doctrinæ. Alias enim non potuissent aliter docere, nisi aliter haberent per quæ docerent.—Quod sumus, hoc sunt Scripturæ ab initio suo. Ex illis sumus antequam nihil aliter fuit, quam sumus.

a soldier, who was a Christian, for having refused to put a crown upon his head, and maintains, that Christians are forbidden to crown themselves, or even to bear arms; this is a custom, he says, observed by all Christians, and proceeds; “It is easy to demand where it is written, that we may not be crowned? On the other hand I ask, where is it written, that we may be crowned? For when they require the authority of Scripture on the other side, they concede that they ought to have the authority of Scripture on their side. For if it be said, that it is lawful to be crowned, because Scripture does not forbid it, we may equally retort, that therefore it is not lawful to be crowned, because Scripture does not command it. What will discipline do in this matter? will it admit both, as if neither were prohibited? or will it reject both, as if neither were enjoined?—If no Scripture has determined this observance, custom certainly has confirmed it, as having, without doubt, emanated from tradition. For how can any practice be observed, if it has not been first handed down? But you say, a written authority must be required to support a tradition. Let us ask, therefore, whether a tradition which is not written ought to be received. We must altogether deny that it is to be received, unless we can adduce examples of other observances, which without the sanction of any Scripture, on the ground of tradition alone, we vindicate on the authority of custom¹.”

¹ TERTULL. *de Coronâ Militis*, c. 2, 3.

Tertullian then quotes the ceremonies observed in baptism, the eucharist, etc., and adds: "If you demand a law taken from the Scriptures for these and other matters of discipline of the same sort, you will find none; we must answer, tradition has established it, custom has confirmed it, and faith has caused it to be observed^m."

He then refers to some customs observed by the Jews, which were not enjoined in their law; and says, "Even in civil affairs custom is admitted as a law, where the law failsⁿ."

It is scarcely necessary to remark how different the traditions, here spoken of, are from those pretended by the Church of Rome. The whole difference lies between tradition which sanctions a *doctrine* not found in Scripture, and tradition which establishes a *custom* about which Scripture is silent.

After a careful examination of the whole of Tertullian's writings, I can find no other passages, which give a colour to the pretensions of the Roman Church; but must subjoin two passages which bear directly on the Article before us.

He is arguing against Hermogenes, who maintained that God could not make all things out of nothing, and that therefore matter was co-eternal with God. Hermogenes received the Scriptures of both Testaments; Tertullian therefore says: "Let Hermogenes' workshop shew that it is written. If it be not written, let him fear the curse denounced

^m Ibid, c. 4.

ⁿ Ibid.

against those who add to or take from the word of God^o."

The other passage is quoted by the venerable Hooker, I may therefore give it in his words :

"We may not give ourselves this liberty to bring in any thing of our will, nor choose any thing that other men bring in of their will; we have the Apostles themselves for authors, which themselves brought nothing of their own will; but the discipline which they received of Christ, they delivered faithfully unto the people^a." Hooker remarks^a, "in which place the name of discipline importeth not, as they who allege it would fain have it construed, but as any man (who noteth the circumstance of the place, and the occasion of uttering the words,) will easily acknowledge, even the selfsame thing it signifieth which the name of doctrine doth; and as well might the one as the other there have been used."

So many pages have been devoted to Tertullian, that the extracts from other writers in support of this part of the Article, must be given without comment.

"There is one God, whom, my brethren, we

^o TERTULL. *adv. Hermog.* c. 22.—Scriptum esse doceat Hermogenis officina. Sinon est scriptum, timeat *væ* illud *adjicientibus aut detrahentibus* destinatum.

^p Idem, *de Præscript. Hæret.* c. 6.—Nobis vero nihil ex nostro arbitrio inducere licet, sed nec eligere, quod aliquis de

arbitrio suo induxerit. Apostolos Domini habemus autores, qui nec ipsi quicquam ex suo arbitrio, quod inducerent, elegerunt: sed acceptam à Christo disciplinam fideliter nationibus adsignaverunt.

^a HOOKER, *Ecclesiast. Pol.* b. ii. s. 5.

know from no other source than from the Holy Scriptures. For as if any one should desire to exercise himself in the wisdom of this world, he could not do so in any other way than by reading the opinions of philosophers; so whosoever of us would exercise ourselves in piety towards God, cannot earn from any other source, than from the oracles of God. Whatsoever things therefore the holy Scriptures declare, let us know; and whatsoever things they teach, let us learn; and as the Father will be believed, so let us believe; and as he wills the Son to be glorified, so let us glorify him; and as he wills the Holy Ghost to be given, so let us receive it. Not according to our own will, nor our own mind, neither doing violence to those things, which have been given to us by God; but as He by the Holy Scriptures has vouchsafed to teach us, so let us understand^r.”

“But if there remaineth any thing which the holy Scripture doth not determine, no other third Scripture ought to be received for the confirmation of knowledge^s.”

“Whence is that tradition? Does it descend from the authority of our Lord and the Gospel, or does it come from the commands and the epistles

^r HIPPOLYTI c. *Noetum*. vol. ii. c. 9. p. 12, 13. ed. Hambr. 1716-18.—^rΕἰς Θεός, ὃν οὐκ ἄλλοθεν ἐπιγινώσκουμεν, ἀδελφοί, ἢ (ἐκ) τῶν ἁγίων γραφῶν.— ὅσα τοίνυν κηρύσσουσιν αἱ θεῖαι γραφαί, ἴδωμεν, καὶ ὅσα διδάσκουσιν, ἐπιγινώμεν, καὶ ὡς θέλει

Πατὴρ πιστεύεσθαι, πιστεύωμεν.

^s ORIGEN. in *Lev. Hom.* v. —Si quid autem superfuerit, quod non divina scriptura discernat, nullam aliam debere tertiam Scripturam ad auctoritatem scientiæ suscipi.

of the Apostles? For that those things are to be done, which are written, God testifies and propounds, saying to Jesus Nave, ‘Let not the book of the Law depart from thy mouth, but thou shalt meditate in it night and day, and thou shalt observe all these things that are written in it to do them.’ The Lord, also, sending his Apostles, commands that ‘all nations should be baptized and taught, that they should observe all things whatsoever he commanded^s.’”

Constantine also, if his authority may be admitted, in his oration to the Council of Nice, reminds them how “the Evangelical and Apostolical books, and the divine oracles of the ancient Prophets, do clearly teach us whatsoever we are to believe concerning God,” and therefore in the conclusion says “Let us take the solution of those things that are questioned from the divinely inspired Oracles; certainly accounting nothing as an article of faith but what may be proved from thence^t.”

“For the holy and divinely inspired Scriptures are of themselves sufficient for the discovery of the truth^u.”

Cyril of Jerusalem, having touched upon the

^s CYPRIANI *Ep.* lxxiv. *ad Pomp.* s. 2.—Unde est ista traditio? Utrumne de Dominicâ et Evangelicâ auctoritate descendens, an de Apostolorum mandatis atque epistolis veniens? Ea enim facienda esse quæ scripta sunt Deus testatur, et proponit ad Jesum Nave dicens; ‘*Non recedet liber legis hujus, etc.*’

^t CONSTANT. *Orat. ad Syn. Nic.* apud THEODORET. *Hist. Eccl.* l. i. c. 7.—Ἐκ τῶν θεοπνεύστων λόγων λάβωμεν τῶν ζητουμένων τὴν λύσιν.—

^u ATHANAS. *Orat. c. Gent.* p. init. Αὐτάρκεις μὲν γὰρ εἰσιν αἱ ἁγίαι καὶ θεόπνευστοι γράφαι πρὸς τὴν τῆς ἀληθείας ἀπαγγελίαν.

great articles of the Christian faith, in his lectures to the Catechumens, says that he will afterwards explain them from Scripture, and adds, “For nothing at all ought to be delivered concerning the divine and holy mysteries of faith, without the holy Scriptures, nor ought we to be at all influenced by probabilities or prepared arguments: nor in any wise believe me that say these things to you, unless you take the demonstration of the things that are declared, out of the holy Scriptures *.”

There is another passage in Cyril’s works to the same purpose, which must here be noticed, because, strange to say, the Romanists will have it that it makes for their traditions: in the old Paris editions, amongst the marginal notes, which stand as finger posts to guide the reader to the true meaning of the author, is the following; *traditiones suas servare jubet*; and true it is, he does bid them observe his traditions; he says “Take heed therefore, brethren, that ye observe the traditions which ye have now received, and write them in the breadth of your hearts.” But the matter will appear in a very different light, if we look at the context; and first go back as far the preceding marginal note, which is also worthy of remark “*fides ecclesiae sola servanda*,” meaning, I conclude, that the Pope is infallible; the passage is as follows; “Hold fast to that faith alone which is now delivered to you by

* CYRIL. HIEROS. *Catech.*

4. Δεῖ γὰρ περὶ τῶν θείων καὶ ἁγίων τῆς πίστεως μυστηρίων, μηδὲ τὸ τυχόν ἄνευ τῶν θείων παραδείδου-
θαι γραφῶν· μηδὲ ἀπλῶς πιθανότησι

καὶ λόγων κατασκευαῖς παραφέρεσθαι.
μηδὲ ἐμοὶ τῷ ταῦτά σοι λέγοντι
ἀπλῶς πιστεύσῃς, ἐὰν τὴν ἀπόδειξιν
τῶν καταγγελλομένων ἀπὸ τῶν θείων
μὴ λάβῃς γραφῶν.

the Church, and which is fortified by all Scripture. For since all cannot read the Scriptures ; but some, incapacity, others, want of leisure, hinders from attaining knowledge, in order that poor souls may not perish through ignorance, we include the whole doctrine of the faith in a few lines, which I wish you to remember when read to you, and to say over to yourselves with all diligence, not writing them on paper, but engraving the memory of them in your hearts, preserving them by meditation, lest one who is only a Catechumen should overhear those things that are delivered to you. And you must keep this faith as your constant companion during the whole period of your life, nor receive any other than this ; not though we ourselves should change, and declare what is contrary to what we now teach, nor though an adverse angel, being transformed into an angel of light, should wish to lead you astray : ‘For though we, or an angel from heaven should preach any other Gospel unto you than that ye have received, let him be accursed ^v.’ And as long as thou hearest this saying, remember thy faith. But on a fitting opportunity draw from the holy Scriptures the proof of every thing that is laid down. For, as we see, the Articles of faith were not composed by men, but the most important things from all Scripture being collected together, make up one doctrine of the faith. For as the seed of mustard in a little grain contains many branches, so this faith in few words embraces all the knowledge of piety that is

^v Gal. i. 8. 9.

comprised in the Old and New Testament. Take heed therefore, etc ^z.”

“ Every word and action ought to be confirmed by the testimony of the divinely inspired Scriptures, to the full confirmation of the good, and the confusion of the evil ^a.” And in another place the same author says, that it is “ a manifest falling off from the faith, and an argument of pride, either to take away any thing from the things that are written, or to introduce any of the things that are not written ^b.”

“ It is an instinct of the devil to follow the sophisms of human minds, and to think any thing divine without the authority of the Scriptures ^c.”

“ As we do not deny those things which are written, so we reject those things that are not written. That God was born of a Virgin we believe, because we read it. That Mary was married after her delivery, we do not believe, because we do not read it ^d.”

^z CYRIL. HIEROS. *Catech.* 5.

—— Έκδέχου δὲ κατὰ τὸν δέοντα καιρὸν τὴν ἀπὸ τῶν θείων γραφῶν περὶ ἐκάστου τῶν ἐγκειμένων σύστασιν. οὐ γὰρ ὡς ἔδοξεν ἀνθρώποις συνετέθη τὰ τῆς πίστεως, ἀλλ’ ἐκ πάσης γραφῆς τὰ καιριώτατα συλλεχθέντα, μίαν ἀναπληροῦ τὴν τῆς πίστεως διδασκαλίαν.—

^a BASIL, *Moral. Reg.* xxvi. c. i. “Οτι δεῖ πᾶν ῥῆμα καὶ πρᾶγμα πιστοῦσθαι τῇ μαρτυρίᾳ τῆς θεοπνεύστου γραφῆς εἰς πληροφορίαν μὲν τῶν ἀγαθῶν, ἐντροπὴν δὲ τῶν πονηρῶν.

^b Idem, *de Fide.* s. 1.

Φάνερα ἔκπτωσις πίστεως καὶ ὑπερηφανίας κατηγορία, ἣ ἀθετεῖν τὶ τῶν γεγραμμένων, ἢ ἐπεισάγειν τῶν μὴ γεγραμμένων.

^c THEOPHIL. ALEX. *Pasch.* 2. *Bib. Max.* tom, v. p. 849. Dæmonici Spiritus est instinctus sophismata humanarum mentium sequi, et aliquid extra Scripturarum auctoritatem putare divinum.

^d HIERON. *c. Helvid.* s. 19. Ut hæc quæ scripta sunt non negamus, ita ea, quæ non sunt scripta, renuimus.—

“When our Lord Jesus had done many things, they were not all written, as the same holy Evangelist testifies, that the Lord Christ had both said and done many things which were not written; but those things were chosen out to be written, which seemed sufficient for the salvation of believers^e.”

And in another place more strongly, which may be given in Hooker’s^f version; “Whether it be question of Christ, or whether it be question of his Church, or of what thing soever the question be; I say not, if we, but if an angel from heaven shall tell us any thing beside that you have received in the Scripture, under the Law and the Gospel, let him be accursed^g.”

As those books of the Old Testament which our Church receives as Canonical, are received also by all other Christian Churches, it seems unnecessary to shew that they constituted the Canon of the primitive Churches, except with a view to prove negatively, that those Churches did not admit any other books to be canonical.

None of the books contained in our Apocryphal catalogue were ever received, as canonical, by any formal act into any Christian Church, until in the fourth session of the Council of Trent the Church of

^e AUGUST. in *Johan. Tr.* l. xlix. s. 1.—electa sunt autem quæ scriberentur, quæ salutis credentium sufficere videbantur.

^f *Eccl. Pol.* l. ii. s. 5.

^g AUGUST. c. *Liter. Petil.* l. iii. c. 6. Proinde sive de Christo, sive de ejus Ecclesiâ, sive de

quâcunque aliâ re, quæ pertinet ad fidem vitamque vestram, non dicam nos, sed—si angelus de cælo vobis annuntiaverit præter quam quod in Scripturis legalibus et evangelicis accepistis, anathema sit.

Rome declared them all to be canonical, except the third and fourth books of Esdras and the prayer of Manasses, which are not there mentioned at all.

The four following lists will be found to agree exactly with our Canon.

Melito, bishop of Sardis in the second century, wrote several works, of which only a few passages are preserved; the following is taken from Eusebius's history^h:

“ Melito to Onesimus, his brother, greeting. Since you have often, on account of your zeal for the word of God, begged of me to make selections for you, from the law and the prophets concerning the Saviour and our whole faith; and as you moreover wished to learn accurately of the old books, how many they are in number and in what order they are written, I have taken great pains to do it; well knowing your zeal for the faith; and your great desire to learn of the word of God; and that, through your earnest love towards God, you desire these more than all things, striving for your eternal safety. I went accordingly to the east, and coming to the very place where these things were preached and transacted, and having accurately learnt the books of the Old Testament, I have sent to you the subjoined list. Their names are as follows. Five books of Moses, viz. Genesis, Exodus, Numbers, Leviticus, Deuteronomy. Joshua Nave, Judges, Ruth. Four books of Kings, two of Paralipomena. The Psalms of

^h Lib. iv. c. 26.

David; the Proverbs of Solomon, which is also called the Wisdom; Ecclesiastes; the Song of Songs; Job. Of Prophets, Isaiah; Jeremiah; and of the twelve one book; Daniel; Ezekiel; Esdras ¹."

By way of explanation, it is necessary to mention that the "Four books of Kings" are the same as the two of Samuel and two of Kings in our Canon; in the Septuagint version they are called the four books of Kings, or of the kingdoms. The two of Paralipomena, or of things omitted, are the two books of Chronicles. The first and second books of Esdras, in our authorised version called of Ezra and Nehemiah, are the same as that called Esdras, the last in the above catalogue; it is probable that the same book contained also the book of Esther, as many supposed that was written by Ezra; some persons, however, may think that Melito did not acknowledge the authenticity of the book of Esther, as some of the Fathers did not: I do not think it necessary to discuss that point.

It may be worth while to notice the way in which Dupin gets over the difficulties that this catalogue must raise to the Romish Canon. He says Melito "gives us a catalogue of the canonical books of the Old Testament, omitting those that are not included in the Canon of the Jews; these are the Books of Ecclesiasticus, Wisdom (for he

¹ MELITO *apud* ROUTH, *Rel. Sacr.* v. i. p. 113.—ἀνελθὼν οὖν εἰς τὴν ἀνατολήν, καὶ ἕως τοῦ τόπου γενόμενος ἔνθα ἐκηρύχθη καὶ ἐπράχθη, καὶ ἀκριβῶς μαθὼν τὰ

τῆς παλαιᾶς διαθήκης βιβλία, ὑποτάξας ἑπεμψά σοι ὅν ἐστι τὰ ὀνόματα Μωϋσέως πέντε. Γέ- νεσις, Ἔξοδος, κ. τ. λ.

calls the Book of the Proverbs by the name of Wisdom,) Judith, Esther, and the two Books of the Maccabees." I have given the passage from Melito at length, to shew that he had no such intention, as Dupin suggests, of giving the Jewish Canon, he evidently gives the whole Scriptures of the Old Testament, that were acknowledged by the Christian Church.

The Laodicæan council, assembled towards the latter end of the fourth century, and afterwards approved by the sixth Constantinopolitan synod, which was also confirmed by Pope Adrian, and so the Loadicæan council confirmed by him too, decreed the number of the canonical books, exactly the same as afterwards determined by this Article: "The books of the Old Testament that ought to be read are, 1. The Creation of the World (Genesis). 2. The going out of Egypt (Exodus). 3. Leviticus. 4. Numbers. 5. Deuteronomy. 6. Joshua, the son of Nun. 7. Judges and Ruth. 8. Esther. 9. The first and second books of Kings. 10. The third and fourth of Kings. 11. The first and second of Chronicles. 12. The first and second of Esdras. 13. The book of one hundred and fifty Psalms. 14. The Proverbs of Solomon. 15. Ecclesiastes. 16. The Song of Songs. 17. Job. 18. Twelve Prophets. 19. Isaiah. 20. Jeremiah and Lamentations. 21. Ezekiel. 22. Daniel^s."

^s Concil. Load. Canon. LX.
Pandect BEVEREGII tom. i. p.
481.—"Ὅσα δεῖ βιβλία ἀναγινώσ-

κεσθαι τῆς παλαιᾶς διαθήκης. α.
Γένεσις Κόσμον. κ. τ. λ.

Gregory Nazianzen gives us the following list of canonical books :

“First Genesis, then Exodus and Leviticus, then Numbers, then Deuteronomy, then Joshua and Judges ; Ruth is the eighth, the ninth and tenth books are the Acts of the kings and Chronicles ; in the last place you have Esdras ; the poetical books are five, of which the first is Job, then David, then three of Solomon, Ecclesiastes, Canticles, and Proverbs ; and there are five books likewise of the prophetical spirit ; these twelve are in one book, Hosea, and Amos, and Micah, the third, then Joel, then Jonas, Abdiah, and Nahum, and Habakkuk and Sophoniah, Haggai, then Zechariah, Malachi ; these are one book : the second, Isaiah, then he that was called Jeremiah from infancy, then Ezekiel, and Daniel¹.”

Epiphanius also gives a catalogue of the canonical books of the Old Testament, which entirely agrees with ours :

“Thus then the Books are contained in four pentateuchs, and other two remain behind ; so that the canonical books are thus, five legislative, Genesis, Exodus, Leviticus, Numbers, Deuteronomy, this is the Pentateuch, and the giving of the law. And five poetical books, the book of Job, then the Psalter, the Proverbs of Solomon, Ecclesiastes, the Song of Songs ; then another Pentateuch which is called the Writings, but by some called the Holy Writings, which are as follows, the book of Joshua the son of Nun, of Judges with

¹ GREG. NAZ. v. *de hoc*. 8. *Balsam*, p. 1081—3.

Ruth, the first of Chronicles with the second, the first of Kings with the second, the third of Kings with the fourth ; another Pentateuch is, the twelve Prophets, Isaiah, Jeremiah, Ezekiel, Daniel, and this is the Prophetical Pentateuch : but there remain two other ; which are, one of Ezra, which is also reckoned, and another book called Esther, and so the twenty-two books are completed ^m.”

To these I must add the testimony of Athanasius, who gives the same catalogue ; and says also what will be important to our qualified reception of the Apocryphal books.

“ Since some persons have attempted to set in order the books that are called Apocryphal, and to mix them with the divinely inspired Scriptures, of which we have been fully certified, as those who saw them, from the beginning, and who being ministers of the word, handed them down from our fathers, it seemed fitting to me, being exhorted thereto by the orthodox brethren, and having learnt the truth, to set out in order the canonical Scriptures, and which have been handed down, and are believed to be from God ; that every one who has been deceived, may convict those who have led him astray.”—He then gives the canonical list, and adds, “ It is true that besides these there are other books which are not put into the Canon, but yet are appointed by the Fathers to be read by those who first come to be instructed in the

^m EPIPHAN. *de Ponderibus et Mensuris*, c. 4. p. 162. tom. ii. ed. Colon. 1622. Οὕτως γ'

οὖν σύγκεινται αἱ βίβλοι, αἱ πεντα-
τεύχοις τέταρσι, καὶ μένουσιν ἄλλαι
δύο ὑστεροῦσαι. κ. τ. λ.

way of pietyⁿ." He then reckons up most of the Apocryphal books.

The Presbyterians and Puritans object to our, in any way, receiving the Apocryphal books. I do not think it necessary, by collecting extracts from each of them, to shew that the books contained in our catalogue, were all read by the early Christians; a few general extracts will suffice.

Epiphanius, speaking of the Apocryphal books, says, "These also are useful and profitable, but are not brought into the number of canonical books^o."

The passage in Jerome to which the Article refers, seems to be the following, in which he is speaking of the Book of Wisdom, and Jesus the son of Sirach, "As therefore the Church reads the books of Judith, and Tobit, and of the Maccabees, but doth not receive them into the number of the canonical books; so these two volumes it reads for the edification of the people, but not to confirm the authority of ecclesiastical doctrines^p."

Ruffinus also, having given the catalogue of the

ⁿ ATHANAS. in *Ep. Festal.*
ἐπειδὴ περ τινὲς ἐπεχείρησαν ἀνατάξασθαι ταυτοῖς τὰ λεγόμενα ἀπόκρυφα, καὶ ἐπιμίξαι ταῦτα τῇ θεοπνεύστῳ γραφῇ—ἔδοξε κἀμοὶ—ἐξῆς ἐκθέσθαι τὰ κανονιζόμενα—ἔστι καὶ ἕτερα βιβλία τούτων ἔξωθεν οὐ κανονιζόμενα μὲν, τετυπωμένα δὲ παρὰ τῶν πατέρων ἀναγινώσκεισθαι τοῖς ἄρτι προσερχομένοις καὶ βουλευμένοις κατηχεῖσθαι τὸν τῆς εὐσεβείας λόγον.

^o EPIPHAN. *de Ponderibus et Mensuris*, c. 4. tom ii. p.

162. Καὶ αὐταὶ χρήσιμοι μὲν εἰσι, καὶ ὠφέλιμοι ἀλλ' εἰς ἀριθμὸν ῥητῶν οὐκ ἀναφέρονται.

^p HIERON. *Prolog. in Libros Salomonis.* Sicut ergo Judith, et Tobiaë, et Maccabæorum libros legit quidem ecclesia, sed eos inter canonicas Scripturas non recipit; sic et hæc duo volumina legat ad ædificationem plebis, non ad auctoritatem ecclesiasticorum dogmatum confirmandam.

canonical books of the Old and New Testament, precisely in accordance with this Article, proceeds.

“ These are they which the Fathers concluded within the Canon, out of which they would have the assertions of our faith to consist. But we must know that there are also other books, which are not called canonical, but ecclesiastical, by the ancients ; such as the Wisdom of Solomon, and another Wisdom which is called of the Son of Sirach, which book among the Latins, is called by this general name ‘ Ecclesiasticus,’ by which word, not the author of the books, but the quality of the writing is surnamed. Of the same order is the book of Tobit and Judith, and the books of the Maccabees. But in the New Testament a little book called the Pastor or Hermas, which is named ‘ The Two ways, or The Judgment according to Peter,’ all which they would have read indeed in the churches, but not produced to confirm the authority of our faith out of them ^a. ”

The framers of our Articles in saying that our Church receives “ All the Books of the New Testament, as they are commonly received,” without giving any enumeration of them, seem to have adopted that course which has been before remarked as the only obvious one in drawing up a rule of faith ; it is unnecessary to give a list of books which none but infidels question, and with them we have nothing to do here. Following the

^a RUFFIN. in *Expos. Symb. ad calcem Sti. Cypriani*, p. 26. ed. Oxon. 1682.—quæ omnia legi quidem in ecclesiis volu-

erunt, non tamen proferri ad auctoritatem ex his fidei confirmandam.

same plan, I do not see the necessity of swelling the present work by the insertion of a number of extracts, which, to prove that all the books, we now receive as canonical, were received by the primitive Church, must be very extensive. The reader who wishes to see the matter proved beyond a doubt must be referred to Dr. Lardner's "Credibility of the Gospel History." Bishop Burnet, in his Exposition of this Article gives a brief historical account of the early reception of the several books of the New Testament, and of the formation of the Canon, as does also Mr. Horne in the first volume of his Introduction.

ARTICLE VII.

Of the Old Testament.

"THE Old Testament is not contrary to the New; for both in the Old and New Testament, everlasting life is offered to mankind by Christ, who is the only Mediator between God and man, being both God and man: wherefore they are not to be heard which feign that the Old Fathers did look only for transitory promises.

"Although the law given from God by Moses, as touching ceremonies and rites, do not bind Christian men, nor the civil precepts thereof ought of necessity to be received in any commonwealth, yet notwithstanding no Christian man whatsoever is free from the obedience of the commandments which are called Moral."

The authority of the books of the Old Testament having been established in the preceding Article, the question then arises, are they binding on Christians, and to what extent ?

The followers of Marcion in the second century, the Manichæans in the third, and the Catharists, who in many respects imitated the Manichæans, in the twelfth, altogether rejected the Old Testament as being contrary to the New. To this point therefore the first class of extracts is directed.

“We love the Prophets, because they also preached the Gospel, and hoped in him (Christ) and waited for him ^a.”

“Moreover, concerning the righteousness of which the law speaks, the writings of the Prophets and Evangelists are found to agree together, because all being filled with the Spirit, spoke by one and the same Spirit of God ^b.”

“Let them not therefore ascribe the unbelief of some persons to the Law ; for the Law did not forbid them to believe in the Son of God, but exhorted them, saying, that men could not any other ways be healed from the old wound of the serpent, unless they believed in him, who, according to the likeness of sinful flesh, is lifted up from the earth upon the tree of martyrdom, and who draws all things to himself, and quickens the dead ^c.”

^a IGNAT. *ad Philad.* c. 4.
Καὶ τοὺς προφῆτας δὲ ἀγαπῶμεν, διὰ
τὸ καὶ αὐτοὺς εἰς τὸ εὐαγγέλιον κα-
τηγγελκέναι, καὶ εἰς αὐτὸν ἐλπίζειν,
καὶ αὐτὸν ἀναμένειν.

^b THEOPHIL. *ad Autolyc.* l.
iii. c. 12. Ἔτι μὲν καὶ περὶ δι-

καιοσύνης ἥς ὁ νόμος εἴρηκεν, ἀκόλουθα
εὐρίσκεται καὶ τὰ τῶν προφητῶν, καὶ
τῶν εὐαγγελίων ἔχειν.—

^c IRENÆI l. iv. c. ii. s. 7.
Non ergo quorundam infideli-
tatem Legi adscribant ; non
enim Lex prohibebat eos cre-

Tertullian says, "The separation of the Law and the Gospel is the peculiar and principal work of Marcion^d." Marcion maintained that the God of the Old Testament was not the God of the New, and consequently he rejected the Law and the Prophets. Tertullian in another part of the same work says, "We so far admit that separation, by reformation, by enlargement, by procreation; as the fruit is separated from the seed, when it becomes fruit from the seed; so also the Gospel is separated from the Law, in so far as it is produced out of the Law. It is another than it, but it does not come from another; it is different, but not contrary^e."

"But all the Scripture is divided into two Testaments. That which preceded the coming and passion of our Lord, that is to say, the Law and the Prophets, is called the Old. But those things which were written after his resurrection are called the New Testament. The Jews are the Old, we the New: but yet they are not diverse, because the New is the fulfilling of the Old, and in both the same Christ is testator^f."

"For our faith ariseth from the two Testaments; nor doeth he wrong that saith, there is the like

dere in Filium Dei, sed et adhortabatur, dicens; non aliter salvari homines ab antiquâ serpentis plagâ nisi credant in eum, etc.

^d TERTULL. *adv. Marcion.* l. i. c. 19. Separatio Legis et Evangelii, proprium et principale opus est Marcionis.

^e Idem, *ibid.* l. iv. c. 11.

—Aliud ab illo, sed non alienum; diversum, sed non contrarium.

^f LACTANT. l. iv. *de Verâ Sap.* c. 20. —Sed tamen diversa non sunt, quia Nova Veteris adimpletio est, et in utroque idem testator est Christus.

measure of perfect faith in both, when the Lord himself saith, ‘If you believed Moses you would believe me also,’ who was the Lord that spoke also in Moses ^g.” And again, “But there is one God in whom the doctrine of the New and of the Old Testament agreeth ^h.”

The Anomæans, against whose tenets Chrysostom published several homilies, first obtained that name in the fourth century; they seem not to have differed from the pure Arians, they held the Son to be of a different nature from the Father, thence called *Ἀνομοίοι*. In this homily Chrysostom shews that the New Testament agrees with the Old;

“Whence,” he says, “shall I begin my discourse? from whencesoever you please, either from the New Testament or the Old; for not only in the Gospels and the writings of the Apostles, but also in the Prophetic books, and throughout all the Old Testament, we may see the glory of the only-begotten Son of God shining forth abundantly.” He then adduces and enlarges on several passages from both Testaments, and adds, “Do you see how the New Testament agrees with the Old ⁱ.”

^g AMBROS. *in Luc.* c. 15. l. vii. Duobus enim testamentis fides nostra consurgit; nec injuriam facit, qui parem dixerit in utroque perfectæ fidei mensuram, cum dicat ipse Dominus, *Si crederetis Moysi, crederetis et mihi*, qui et in Moyse Dominus est locutus.

^h Idem, *in Luc.* c. 20. l. x. s. 4. Sed unus Deus in quo et Novi et Veteris Testamenti doctrina concordat.

ⁱ CHRYSOST. *Hom. c. Anomæos.* vi. Πόθεν οὖν ἡμῖν ἀρκτέον τοῦ λόγου; ὅθεν ἂν βούλησθε· εἴτε ἀπὸ καινῆς, εἴτε ἀπὸ παλαιᾶς· οὐ γὰρ δὴ μόνον ἐν τοῖς Εὐαγγελίοις, καὶ τοῖς Ἀποστολικαῖς ῥήμασιν, ἀλλὰ καὶ ἐν τοῖς προφητικαῖς, καὶ πάσῃ τῇ παλαιᾷ μετὰ πολλῆς τῆς περιουσίας διαλάμπουσιν ἔστιν ἰδεῖν τὴν τοῦ μονογενοῦς δόξαν.—Ὅρα· πῶς σύμφωνος ἡ καινὴ τῇ παλαιᾷ;

And in a discourse on 2 Cor. iv. 13, he says, “So that there is only difference of names in the two Testaments, not opposition or contrariety; for the Old is called Old from the New, but its being Old is not from any opposition or contrariety, but from the difference of the name only^k.”

The Article then assigns a reason why the Old Testament is not contrary to the New, viz. because in both, “everlasting life is offered to mankind by Christ, who is the only Mediator between God and man, being both God and man.”

That everlasting life is offered to mankind by Christ, in both Testaments, and that Christ is the only Mediator between God and man, need not be made the subject of separate proof, as most of the passages given under the first proposition in this Article assert one or other of these things, as will also most of those next given; the assertion that Christ “is both God and man” is supported under the second Article.

The next point to be shewn therefore, is, that the old Fathers did not look only for transitory promises.

The Anabaptists at the period of the Reformation seem to have held that the promises made by God to the Patriarchs were only transitory promises, and against them therefore this part of the present Article was probably directed^l.

^k Idem, in 2 Cor. iv. 13. *Serm.* xxv. “Ὅστε διαφορὰ μόνον ἐστὶν ὀνομάτων ἐν ταῖς διαθήκαις, οὐ μάχη, οὐδὲ ἐναντιώσεις. Τὸ γὰρ παλαιὸν ἐκ τοῦ καινοῦ γίνεται παλαιόν·

τοῦτο δὲ οὐ μάχης, οὐδὲ ἐναντιώσεως, ἀλλὰ διαφορᾶς ὀνόματος μόνης.

^l See HEY's *Lectures*, v. iii. p. 46, 47.

Ignatius in a passage given a few pages back, says, that the Prophets “hoped in Christ and waited for him;” he continues thus; “In whom also having believed, they were saved, in the unity of Jesus Christ, being saints deservedly beloved and admired, to whom Jesus Christ bore witness, and who were numbered in the Gospel of our common hope^m.”

“God promised Abraham corporeal things, but he sought for spiritual things. Where, you will ask, did God promise him corporeal things, and did he desire spiritual things? ‘Get thee out,’ he says, ‘of thy country, and from thy kindred, and from thy father’s house unto a land that I will shew theeⁿ.’ Both the former land, and the latter land that was to be given him, were corporeal. What then did he? or rather let us not hear him, but attend to Paul who speaks of him; that we may learn, that he looked not to this land, although God had promised him this, but that he let go the present, and eagerly longed for the future. What then does Paul say? ‘These all died in faith^o,’ speaking of Abraham, and Isaac, and Jacob, and all the righteous. For not only Abraham, but all of them were partakers of this same doctrine. ‘These all died in faith, not having received the promises, but having seen them afar off’^p.”

“But the Old Testament, to them that rightly

^m IGNAT. *ad Philad.* c. 4.

Ἐν ᾧ καὶ πιστεύσαντες ἐσώθησαν ἐν ἐνότητι Ἰησοῦ Χριστοῦ, οὐτε ἀξιαγάπητοὶ καὶ ἀξιοθαύμαστοι ἅγιοι, ὑπὸ Ἰησοῦ Χριστοῦ μεμαρτυρημένοι, καὶ συνηριθμημένοι ἐν τῷ εὐαγγελίῳ τῆς κοινῆς ἐλπίδος.

ⁿ Gen. xii. 1.

^o Heb. xi. 13.

^p CHRYSOST. *in Gen.* Serm. ix. — οὐδὲ γὰρ Ἀβραὰμ μόνος, ἀλλὰ πάντες τῆς αὐτῆς ἦσαν φιλοσοφίας κοινωνοί. —

understand it, is a prophecy of the New Testament. And therefore in that first people, the holy Patriarchs and Prophets, who understood what they did, or what was done by them, had that hope of eternal salvation in the New Testament. For to that belonged what they understood and loved ; which although it was not yet revealed, was however then typified. But they belonged to the Old Testament, who desired no more than the temporal promises there thought of, in which they did not understand the eternal promises typified and foretold ^a.”

Augustine has a chapter in the tenth book of his work *De Civitate Dei* of which the title is as follows, “That all the saints, both during the time of the Law, and of preceding ages, were justified by the doctrine and faith in Christ ^r.”

This Article next asserts that the Jewish rites and ceremonies are not binding on Christians, and that their civil polity is not of necessity to be received. The framers of the Articles, however, by using the word “although,” seem to have thought the matter not deserving of a direct denial ; and though it seems scarcely requisite to adduce many authorities shewing the practice of the primitive Christians, yet it must be here noticed, that in ad-

^a AUGUST. c. *Faust.* lib. xv. c. 2. —Itaque et in illo primo populo sancti patriarchæ et prophetæ qui intelligebant quid agebant, vel quod per eos agebatur, in Novo Testamento habebant istam spem salutis eternæ.

^r Idem, *de Civitate Dei*, l. x. c. 25. Omnes sanctos et sub Legis tempore, et sub prioribus sæculis, in sacramento et fide Christi justificados fuisse.

dition to the early Jewish converts, many of whom were desirous of upholding their former customs and laws, there were at the time of the Reformation many judaizing Christians, who in different degrees and various particulars wished to restore the observance of the Jewish laws.

Little need be added to the authority of Justin Martyr; the passages to be found in his Dialogue with Trypho, in which the abrogation of the ceremonial law is insisted on, are so numerous, that the work can be scarcely dipped into without one's falling on some of them; indeed it is the chief topic of discussion from the tenth to the twenty-fourth section. It must be observed, at the same time, that though Justin speaks generally of the law, he evidently directs his arguments against the observance of the ceremonial law only, for the neglect of that is amongst the chief of his opponent's objections to the Christian dispensation. It will be sufficient to extract one or two passages.

“ But now, O Trypho, I have read that there was to be a last law, and a testament the most binding of all, which now it behoves all men to observe, as many as desire to attain unto the inheritance of God. For that which was delivered in Horeb, is now an old law, and belongs to you only; but this belongs to all mankind; but a law made after a former law, operates as a repeal of the former law; just as a subsequent testament puts an end to a former one. But we have an eternal law, and a law which is last of all, which Christ

gave, and a faithful testament, after which there is no law, nor precept, nor commandment^s.”

And again in a subsequent place; “The Gentiles who believe in Christ, and have repented of their sins, will have their inheritance with the patriarchs and prophets, and whatever just men have sprung from Jacob, although they do not observe the sabbath, nor are circumcised, nor keep the appointed feasts^t.”

Tertullian, speaking of St. Paul says; “If he pointed out that some false brethren had crept in, who wished to bring over the Galatians to another Gospel^u, he shews that that adultery of the Gospel had not for its object the transferring their faith to another God and Christ, but to uphold the discipline of the law; pointing out those, for instance, who advocated the circumcision, and observed the times, and days, and months, and years of the Jewish ceremonies, which now they ought to acknowledge to be abolished, according to the new appointment of the Creator, who had long since foretold by his prophets this very thing, as by Isaiah, etc.^x” He then quotes Isaiah xliii. 19; Jeremiah xxxi. 32; and iv. 4; Hosea ii. 11; and Isaiah i. 14.

^s JUSTIN. *Dial. cum Tryph.* s. 11.—‘Ο γὰρ ἐν Χωρήβ, παλαιὸς ἦδη νόμος, καὶ ὑμῶν μόνων.—

^t Idem *ibid.* s. 26.—εἰ καὶ μὴ σαββατίζουσι, μηδὲ περιτέμνονται, μηδὲ τὰς ἑορτὰς φυλάσσουσι.

^u Gal. ii. 4.

^x TERTULL. *adv. Marcion.* lib. i. c. 20.—deprehendens sci-

licet illos, circumcisionem vindicantes, et observantes tempora, et dies, et menses, et annos Judaicarum cæremoniarum, quas jam exclusas agnovisse debuerant, secundum innovatam dispositionem Creatoris, olim de hoc ipso prædicantis, etc.

Origen, arguing for the truth of Christianity from the low estate in which our Saviour appeared upon earth, and the wonderfully rapid propagation of his religion, says,

“ But if any would make more particular enquiries concerning such an one, how could he do otherwise than ask, in what way one brought up in meanness and poverty, and who had received no liberal education, nor been instructed in modes of reasoning, or philosophy, whereby he might have better hopes of attracting the multitude, and gaining over the people, and winning over to himself a greater number of hearers, how could he do otherwise, I say, than enquire how such an one attempted to teach new doctrines; publishing to mankind a system, that both puts an end to the rites of the Jews, at the same time that it exalts their prophets, and, above all, upsets the laws of the Greeks, respecting the worship of the Deity?”

In the last place, “ No Christian man whatsoever is free from the obedience of the commandments which are called Moral.”

The Antinomians might have been mentioned before, as setting aside the whole of the Jewish law; and bishop Burnet was of opinion that the whole of this Article relates to them; but it is difficult to see how that part which repudiates the ceremonial law can have reference to those who rejected the whole. Some enthusiasts also, who

Υ ORIGEN *c. Cels.* l. i. c. 29.
—ἐπιστάγων τῷ γένει τῶν ἀνθρώπων
λόγον, τὰ τε Ἰουδαίων ἔθνη καταλύ-

οντα, μετὰ τοῦ σεμνοποιεῖν αὐτῶν
τοὺς προφῆτας.

called themselves Anabaptists, at the time of the Reformation, set aside not only the Jewish law, but all law whatsoever; this sect proceeded to great excesses in Germany, particularly at Munster in Westphalia. The nineteenth of king Edward the Sixth's Articles had this additional clause; "Wherefore they are not to be heard, which teach that the Holy Scriptures were given to none but to the weak; and brag continually of the Spirit, by which they do pretend that all whatsoever they preach is suggested to them; though manifestly contrary to the Holy Scriptures."

That the early Christians considered themselves bound to the observance of the moral precepts of the law of Moses, will be made sufficiently clear from the following extracts;

"We also confess God, but only one God, the founder, and creator, and maker of this universe; and we know that all things are governed by providence, but by him only; and we have learnt a holy law; but we have for our lawgiver him who is truly God, who teaches us to act justly, and to be pious, and to do good works^z." He then refers to the ten commandments, to which he adds also some other moral precepts from the Old Testament. Under piety he places the first two commandments, under good works the fifth, and under justice the sixth to the tenth.

"That our Lord did not abrogate the natural

^z THEOPHIL. *ad Autolyc.*
l. iii. c. 9.—καὶ νόμον ἅγιον με-
μαθήκαμεν· ἀλλὰ νομοθέτην ἔχομεν

τὸν ὄντως Θεὸν, ὃς διδάσκει ἡμᾶς
δικαιοπραγεῖν, καὶ εὐσεβεῖν, καὶ κα-
λοποιεῖν.

duties prescribed by the Law, by which duties a man is justified, and which those men who were justified by faith, and pleased God, observed before the giving of the Law; but that he enlarged them, and supplied what was wanting in them, is shewn by his own words; for he says, ‘It was said by them of old time, etc.^a,’” Matt. v. 21; and then Irenæus continues:

“For all these things do not contain any contrariety or dissolution of things past, as those that are with Marcion insist; but their fulness and extension, as our Saviour himself saith^b, ‘Unless your righteousness exceed the righteousness of the Scribes and Pharisees, ye shall not enter into the kingdom of heaven^c.’”

And again, having observed that God did not stand in need of man, but that man could not attain unto eternal life except by obedience to God, he quotes the words spoken by God through Moses^d, “Choose life, that both thou and thy seed may live: that thou mayest love the Lord thy God, and that thou mayest obey his voice, and that thou mayest cleave unto him; for he is thy life and the length of thy days.” “To which life,” continues

^a IRENÆI *adv. Hæres.* l. iv. c. xiii. s. l. Et quia Dominus naturalia legis, per quæ homo justificatur, quæ etiam ante legislationem custodiebant, qui fide justificabantur, et placebant Deo, non dissolvit, sed extendit, et implevit; ex sermonibus ejus ostenditur.

^b Matth. v. 20.

^c IRENÆI *adv. Hæres.* l. iv. c. xiii. s. l. Omnia enim hæc non contrarietatem et dissolutionem præteritorum continent, sicut qui à Marcione sunt vociferantur; sed plenitudinem et extensionem; sicut ipse ait; *Nisi abundaverit justitia vestra*, etc.

^d Deut. xxx. 19, 20.

our author, " God preparing man, himself by himself spoke the words of the Decalogue to all men alike ; and therefore they in like manner abide with us, receiving enlargement and increase, but not dissolution, by his coming in the flesh. But the commands of servitude he by Moses enjoined his people separately, suited to their instruction ; as also Moses himself said^e, ' And the Lord commanded me at that time to teach you statutes and judgments.' These things, therefore, which were given them for servitude, and for a mark of distinction, he has circumscribed by a new testament of freedom. But those things which are natural, and free, and common to all men, he has increased and enlarged, giving abundantly, without sparing, to mankind by adoption, to know God the Father, and to love him with all their heart, and without backwardness to follow his Word, not only abstaining from evil works, but even from the desire of them^f."

" Liberty in Christ hath done no wrong to innocence. The whole law of piety, of holiness, of humanity, of truth, of chastity, of justice, of pity, of benevolence, of modesty, still remains in force. In which law, ' blessed is the man that shall meditate day and night^g.' Concerning which the same David says in another place^h, ' the law of the Lord

^e Deut. iv. 14.

^f IRENÆI *adv. Hæres.* l. iv. c. xvi. s. 4.—ideo similiter permanent apud nos, extensionem et augmentum, sed non dissolu-

tionem accipientia per carnalem ejus adventum.

^g Ps. i. 2.

^h Ps. xix. 7, 8.

is perfect, converting the soul; the statutes of the Lord are right, delighting the heart; the commandment of the Lord is pure, enlightening the eyes.' And so the Apostleⁱ; 'Wherefore the law is holy, and the commandment holy, just, and good;' for instance, 'Thou shalt not commit adultery.' And in a former chapter^k, 'Do we then make void the law through faith? God forbid: yea, we establish the law:' that is to say, in those things which now being interdicted in the New Testament, are forbidden by a more weighty commandment. Instead of 'Thou shalt not commit adultery,' 'Whosoever looketh on a woman to lust after her, hath committed adultery with her already in his heart^l:' and instead of, 'Thou shalt not kill,' 'Whosoever shall say to his brother, Raca, shall be in danger of hell-fire^m.' Consider whether the law against adultery is still entire, to which is added a commandment against lustingⁿ."

"There are some laws of our nature which were given from the beginning, when God formed man, of which Paul says^o, 'For when the Gentiles, which have not the law, do by nature the things contained in the law, these, having not the law, are a law unto themselves;' and again^p, 'For I delight in the law of God after the inward man.' There

ⁱ Rom. vii. 12.

^k Rom. iii. 31.

^l Matt. v. 28.

^m Matt. v. 22. Tertullian here, as in many other places, quotes incorrectly.

ⁿ TERTULL. *de Pudicit.* c. 6.

Libertas in Christo non fecit innocentiae injuriam. Manet lex tota pietatis, etc.—Quære an subsit lex non mœchandi, cui accessit, nec concupiscendi.

^o Rom. ii. 14.

^p Rom. vii. 22.

are also commandments which are written, and all these are still in force; but if some have been repealed, it is that they have been changed not for the worse, but for the better; for that one, ‘Thou shalt do no murder,’ has not been repealed, but added to; and that other, ‘Thou shalt not commit adultery,’ has not been done away with, but enlarged; and therefore he said^q, ‘I am not come to destroy the law or the prophets, but to fulfil^r.’”

ARTICLE VIII.

Of the Creeds.

“THE three creeds, Nice Creed, Athanasius’s Creed, and
“that which is commonly called the Apostles’ Creed,
“ought thoroughly to be received and believed, for they
“may be proved by most certain warrants of Holy Scrip-
“ture.”

From the very earliest ages of Christianity, it was the practice of every Church, settled in different parts of the world, to prepare the catechumens for baptism, by explaining to them the nature of that faith, which they were about to profess, and

^q Matt. v. 17.

^r CHRYSOST. in Ps. cx.—
Ἐντολαί εἰσι καὶ αἱ γραπταί, καὶ
αὗται πᾶσαι μεμενέκασιν· εἰδὲ τινες

κατελύθησαν, οὐκ ἐπὶ τὸ χεῖρον, ἀλλ’
ἐπὶ τὸ βέλτιον μεταρρυθμισθεῖσαι,
κ. τ. λ.

by requiring from them, or their sponsors, such profession. No one certain form of a creed was prescribed universally to all Churches; "every Church had liberty to frame their own creeds, as they did their own liturgies, without being tied precisely to any one form of words, so long as they kept to the analogy of faith and doctrine at first delivered by the Apostles^a."

Of the many forms of ancient creeds that have reached our times, the Church of England retains three, which were most generally used from the fourth century to the time of the Reformation. These the present Article asserts to be agreeable to the Word of God, and it is the business of this work to shew that they are consistent with the faith of the early Fathers. Almost every Article contained in them will be found fully supported by the passages adduced under other Articles, they will not therefore require a detailed proof.

The most convenient plan seems to be to give a short history of each of these Creeds, and to subjoin some of the earlier formulæ, which are to be found in the preceding writers.

First then, as to the *Nice* or *Nicene Creed*.

In the year of our Lord 325 the emperor Constantine the Great summoned all the Bishops of the Christian world to meet at Nice, in Bithynia, for the purpose of putting an end to a contention that had arisen respecting the proper time of ob-

^a BINGH. B. x. c. iii. s. 6.

serving Easter, and also for the suppression of the Arian heresy, which had then lately arisen, was spreading far and wide, and caused the most violent divisions in the Church.

When the Council had met, to the number of three hundred and eighteen Bishops, they consulted, amongst other things, about settling one rule of Christian faith over the whole world; all, with the exception of some few heretics, agreed in the fundamental points of doctrine, and in the substance of the creed, but, as was to be expected from their coming from so many and so widely distant places, they differed as to the terms in which they were expressed, and in the explanation and number of the Articles.

Amongst others Pamphilius Eusebius, bishop of Cæsarea Palestina, presented the creed of his own Church, which was made the groundwork of the Nicene Creed: it was introduced with the following preamble—

“ The faith expounded by us, and as we have received from the Bishops that were before us, and in our first catechizing, and when we received baptism, as we have learned from the Holy Scriptures, as we believed and taught in our presbytery and in our episcopacy, so also now believing, we make known our faith unto you; and this is it.—‘ We believe in one God Father Almighty, maker of all things both visible and invisible; and in one Lord Jesus Christ, the Word of God, God of God, light of light, life of life, the only begotten Son, the first born of every creature, before all worlds begotten

of God the Father ; by whom also all things were made ; who for our salvation was made flesh ; and conversed amongst men, and suffered, and rose again the third day ; and ascended to the Father, and will come again in glory to judge the quick and the dead : And we believe in one Holy Ghost ; believing every one of these to be and to exist, the Father truly a Father, and the Son truly a Son, and the Holy Ghost truly an Holy Ghost.' As also our Lord, sending his disciples to preach the Gospel, said, ' Go teach all nations, baptizing them in the name of the Father, and of the Son, and of the Holy Ghost.'^b"

One of the principal objects of this Council, as has been stated, was to suppress the Arian heresy, which denied the divinity of Christ ; in the Creed, ultimately adopted, this point was put beyond dispute, as far as the authority of any human tribunal could prevail. It was as follows :

^b SOCRAT. *Hist. Eccl.* lib. i. c. 8. Ἡ ὑψ' ἡμῶν ἐκτεθεῖσα πίστις, καὶ καθὼς παρελάβομεν παρὰ τῶν πρὸ ἡμῶν ἐπισκόπων καὶ ἐν τῇ κατηχήσει, καὶ ὅτε καὶ τὸ λουτρὸν λαμβάνομεν, καθὼς ἀπὸ τῶν θείων γραφῶν μεμαθήκαμεν, καὶ ὡς ἐν τῷ πρεσβυτεριῷ καὶ ἐν αὐτῇ τῇ ἐπισκοπῇ ἐπιστεῦόμεν τε καὶ ἐδιδάσκομεν, οὕτω καὶ νῦν πιστεύοντες τὴν ἡμετέραν πίστιν ὑμῖν προσαναφέροντες· ἔστι δὲ αὕτη. Πιστεύομεν εἰς ἕνα Θεὸν Πατέρα παντοκράτορα, τὸν τῶν ἀπάντων ὁρατῶν τε καὶ ἀοράτων Ποιητὴν· καὶ εἰς ἕνα Κύριον Ἰησοῦν Χριστὸν, τὸν τοῦ Θεοῦ Λόγον, Θεὸν ἐκ Θεοῦ, φῶς ἐκ φωτός, ζωὴν ἐκ ζωῆς, Υἱὸν μονογενῆ, πρωτότοκον πάσης κτί-

σεως, πρὸ πάντων τῶν αἰώνων ἐκ τοῦ Θεοῦ Πατρὸς γεγεννημένον· δι' οὗ καὶ ἐγένετο τὰ πάντα· τὸν διὰ τὴν ἡμετέραν σωτηρίαν σαρκωθέντα, καὶ ἐν ἀνθρώποις πολιτεύσαντον, καὶ παθόντα, καὶ ἀναστάντα τῇ τρίτῃ ἡμέρᾳ, καὶ ἀνελθόντα πρὸς τὸν Πατέρα, καὶ ἥξοντα πάλιν ἐν δόξῃ κρίναι ζῶντας καὶ νεκρούς· πιστεύομεν καὶ εἰς ἓν Πνεῦμα Ἅγιον· τούτων ἕκαστον εἶναι καὶ ὑπάρχειν πιστεύοντες, Πατέρα ἀληθῶς Πατέρα, καὶ Υἱὸν ἀληθῶς Υἱόν, καὶ Πνεῦμα Ἅγιον ἀληθῶς Ἅγιον Πνεῦμα· καθὼς καὶ Κύριος ἡμῶν, ἀποστέλλων εἰς τὸ κήρυγμα τοὺς ἑαυτοῦ μαθητάς, εἶπε· Πορευθέντες μαθητεύσατε πάντα τὰ ἔθνη. κ. τ. λ.

“ We believe in one God, Father Almighty, maker of all things visible and invisible: and in one Lord Jesus Christ, the Son of God, begotten of the Father, the only begotten, that is of the substance of the Father; God of God, Light of Light, very God of very God, begotten not made, of one substance with the Father; by whom all things were made, both that are in heaven, and that are on earth; who for us men, and for our salvation, came down, and was made flesh, and became man, suffered and rose again the third day, and ascended into heaven, and will come again to judge the quick and dead: and in the Holy Ghost^c.”

To the creed was added an anathema, in the following words; “ But those who say there was a time when he was not, and that he was made of nothing, or who say that he was of another substance or essence, or created, or convertible, or changeable, such the catholic and apostolic Church pronounceth accursed^d.”

This creed, with the anathema, was subscribed

^c SOCRAT. *Hist. Eccl.* lib. i. c. 8. THEODORET. lib. ii. c. 12. ATHANAS. *Ep. ad Jovian. de Fide*, p. 247. Πιστεύομεν εἰς ἓνα Θεόν, Πατέρα παντοκράτορα, πάντων ὁρατῶν τε καὶ ἀοράτων Ποιητὴν· καὶ εἰς ἓνα Κύριον Ἰησοῦν Χριστόν, τὸν Υἱὸν τοῦ Θεοῦ, γεννηθέντα ἐκ τοῦ Πατρὸς, μονογενῆ, τουτέστιν ἐκ τῆς οὐσίας τοῦ Πατρὸς· Θεὸν ἐκ Θεοῦ, φῶς ἐκ φωτός, Θεὸν ἀληθινὸν ἐκ Θεοῦ ἀληθινοῦ· γεννηθέντα οὐ ποιηθέντα· ὁμοούσιον τῷ Πατρί· δι’ οὗ τὰ πάντα ἐγένετο, τὰ τε ἐν τῷ οὐρανῷ καὶ τὰ ἐν τῇ γῇ· τὸν δι’ ἡμᾶς τοὺς ἀνθρώπους καὶ διὰ τὴν ἡμετέραν

σωτηρίαν κατελθόντα, καὶ σαρκωθέντα, καὶ ἑνανθρωπήσαντα, παθόντα, καὶ ἀναστάντα τῇ τρίτῃ ἡμέρᾳ, καὶ ἀνελθόντα εἰς τοὺς οὐρανοὺς, καὶ ἐρχόμενον πάλιν κρῖναι ζῶντας καὶ νεκροὺς, καὶ εἰς τὸ Πνεῦμα τὸ Ἅγιον.

^d Idem, *ibid.* Τοὺς δὲ λέγοντας, ἣν ποτὲ ὅτε οὐκ ἦν, καὶ πρὶν γεννηθῆναι οὐκ ἦν, καὶ ὅτι ἐξ οὐκ ὄντων ἐγένετο, ἢ ἐξ ἑτέρας ὑποστάσεως ἢ οὐσίας φάσκοντας εἶναι, ἢ κτιστὸν, ἢ τρεπτὸν, ἢ ἀλλοίωτον, τὸν Υἱὸν τοῦ Θεοῦ, τούτους ἀναθεματίζει ἡ καθολικὴ καὶ ἀποστολικὴ ἐκκλησία.

by all the three hundred and eighteen members of the Council, with the exception of five who were followers of Arius.

It will be observed that the creed agreed upon at this Council, as given us by the historians from whose writings it is now extracted, ended with the words, "And in the Holy Ghost." In the same century the Macedonian heresy, which denied the divinity of the Holy Ghost, sprung up: accordingly the emperor Theodosius, for the further confirmation of the Nicene Creed, and for other purposes, especially the suppression of this new heresy, called together another general Council, which met at Constantinople A. D. 381. On that occasion the alterations, which will be remarked on a comparison of the first part of that now called the Nicene, and the above creed, were made, and the following was added at the end; "And in the Holy Ghost, the Lord, and giver of life, proceeding from the Father, who with the Father and the Son together is worshipped and glorified, who spake by the Prophets: and in one catholic and apostolic Church: we acknowledge one baptism for the remission of sins; we look for the resurrection of the dead, and the life of the world to come."

It may perhaps seem extraordinary that the Council at Nice having taken the creed of the

^e *Ex Concil. Gen. ed.*
BINII.—Καὶ εἰς τὸ Πνεῦμα τὸ
Ἅγιον, τὸ Κύριον, τὸ ζωοποιὸν τὸ ἐκ
τοῦ Πατρὸς ἐκπορευόμενον, τὸ
σὺν Πατρὶ καὶ Ὑἱῷ συμπροσ-
κυνούμενον καὶ συνδοξαζόμενον, τὸ
λαλήσαν διὰ τῶν προφητῶν εἰς

μίαν ἁγίαν καθολικὴν καὶ ἀποσ-
τολικὴν ἐκκλησίαν· ὁμολογοῦμεν ἓν
βάπτισμα εἰς ἄφεσιν ἁμαρτιῶν.
προσδοκῶμεν ἀνάστασιν νεκρῶν, καὶ
ζωὴν τοῦ μέλλοντος αἰῶνος· Et
vide EPIPHAN. in *Anchor.* tom
ii. p. 122.

Church at Cæsarea, as the groundwork of its Creed, should have omitted or struck out the latter part which relates to the Holy Ghost, merely professing a belief in the Holy Ghost, and so concluding. But that such was the case is not entirely free from doubt^f. Athanasius^g and Gregorius^h Cæsariensis both speak of the Acts of the Nicene Synod, which are now lost; and the former mentions that those Acts assert “That the Son is of the same substance with the Father,” and that “the Holy Ghost is to be glorified together with the Father and the Son.” So that it is not improbable that the Nicene Council after the Creed had been confirmed as above, added explanations of it, which most Churches inserted as part of the Creed itself. Whether this conjecture be right or not, it is certain that some years before the Constantinopolitan Council met, the latter words relating to the Holy Ghost were used in several Churches as part of the Nicene Creed. Thus Cyrilⁱ of Jerusalem in his exposition of the creed, above twenty years before the meeting of the latter Council, concludes the Creed in almost the same words that this Council afterwards did: and Epiphanius, who wrote his “Anchorate” six or seven years before this Council, has set down in his creed the same explanations and additions with which

^f See HEY on this Art. s. 5.

^g ATHANAS. *Ep. ad Fratres Orthodoxos*.

^h GREG. Cæsar. *de* 318 *Patr. Nicen. Orat.* apud METAPHRAST, *Jul.* 10.

ⁱ CYRIL. HIEROS. *Catech.* xviii. Εἰς ἓν βάπτισμα μετανοίας εἰς ἄφεσιν ἁμαρτιῶν, καὶ εἰς μίαν καθολικὴν ἐκκλησίαν, καὶ εἰς σαρκὸς ἀνάστασιν, καὶ εἰς ζωὴν αἰώνιον.

the Constantinopolitan Council afterwards promulgated it; and he adds, "It is the faith delivered by the Holy Apostles, and in the Church in the Holy City by all the holy Bishops together to the number of three hundred and ten and upwards^k."

This Creed thus confirmed was generally adopted in the Western as well as in the Eastern Churches, and inserted in their liturgies; but afterwards there arose a division as to one Article, which caused a vast schism in the Eastern and Western Churches. The latter generally held that the Holy Ghost proceeds from the Father and the Son, and inserted words in the Creed to that effect; the Eastern Church held that the Holy Ghost proceeds from the Father only, and would not consent to the insertion. This difference of faith or opinion is now nearly extinguished, or at all events is no longer the subject of controversy. Our Church, as will be seen in the Creed used in the Communion service, as well as in the Second of her Articles, holds that the Holy Ghost proceeds "from the Father and the Son."

So much space has been occupied in speaking of the Nicene Creed, that little can be said of the two others. Nor is it important to dwell at any length upon them, for they contain no doctrines which are not expressed in or deducible from the Nicene Creed, or which are not supported in other parts of this work. The Nicene Creed moreover is more

^k EPIPHAN, *Anchorat*. Αὕτη τῇ ἀγίῃ πόλει ἀπὸ πάντων ὁμοῦ
 μὲν ἡ πίστις παρεδόθη ἀπὸ τῶν τῶν ἀγίων ἐπισκόπων ὑπὲρ τριακο-
 ἀγίων ἀποστόλων καὶ ἐν ἐκκλησίᾳ σίων δέκα τὸν ἄριθμον.

particularly deserving of lengthened notice, as it represents the faith of the whole Christian world, solemnly promulgated at the first two general Councils.

The Athanasian Creed, as is well known, takes its name from Athanasius Bishop of Alexandria, a distinguished opponent of the Arian heresy, at the time of the Nicene Council. Some persons have supposed him to have been its framer, but on that point it is unnecessary to say any thing in this work, as our Article does not assert it to be his, but refers to it, as known by that name ¹.

Dr. Waterland, whose work on this subject is the generally received authority, supposes it to have been composed about the year 430. But it was not called the Creed of Athanasius until near the end of the seventh century.

The creed commonly called the Apostles' Creed was, with the exception of one or two Articles, (which must have been added afterwards,) very early received into the Christian Church. But though many of the Fathers speak of a Creed compiled by the Apostles, no one prior to Ruffinus^m speaks of this particular Creed as of their composition.

It will sufficeⁿ in this place to remark, that it

¹ In the Rubric in our Common Prayer Book it is called, "The Creed commonly called the Creed of St. Athanasius."

^m RUFFIN. *Expos. Symb. ad calcem Sti. Cypriani.* p. 17.

ⁿ The reader who wishes to see more on this subject is referred to BINGHAM'S *Antiquities*, B. x. c. iii.; BISHOP USHER *de Symb. Romano*; and PEARSON *on the Creed*.

contains only one Article, (the Communion of Saints,) which is not also to be found in the Nicene Creed; and that Creed having been shewn to express the faith of the primitive Church, it follows that our Church, in making use of this Creed, professes the same doctrine as the primitive Churches.

It remains to add or refer to some of the earlier Creeds used in the different Churches. Three have been given in this or other preceding Articles; that which Irenæus has left us, and which will be found^o at length under the first Article, is the earliest that has come down to us. One also from Tertullian has been already inserted^p. And the creed produced by Eusebius at the Council of Nice, as used in the Church of Cæsarea, is given under this Article^q.

To these may be added, the creed contained in the Apostolical Constitutions, which Cotelerius supposes to have been compiled towards the end of the third century^r.

“ I believe, and am baptized in one unbegotten, the only true God Almighty, the Father of Christ, the Creator and Maker of all things, of whom are all things; and in one Lord Jesus Christ, his only begotten Son, the first-born of every creature, who before all ages was begotten, not made, by the good will of the Father, by whom all things were made in heaven and in earth, visible and invisible ;

^o Ante, p. 21.

^p Ante, p. 80.

^q Ante, p. 136.

^r In BING . B. x. c. iv. And

in the Appendix to PEARSON *on the Creed*, many more of the early creeds are given at length.

who in the last times came down from heaven, and taking flesh upon him, was born of the holy Virgin Mary, and lived a holy life according to the laws of God his Father, and was crucified under Pontius Pilate, and died for us, and the third day, after he had suffered, rose again from the dead, and ascended into heaven, and sitteth on the right hand of the Father, and shall come again with glory in the end of the world to judge both the quick and the dead, of whose kingdom there shall be no end. And I am baptized into the Holy Ghost, that is to say, the Comforter, which wrought effectually in all the saints from the beginning of the world, and was afterward sent to the Apostles by the Father, according to the promise of our Lord and Saviour Jesus Christ; and after the Apostles to all others, who in the Holy Catholic Church believe the resurrection of the flesh, the remission of sins, the kingdom of heaven, and the life of the world to come ^s.”

ARTICLE IX.

Of Original or Birth Sin.

“ ORIGINAL Sin standeth not in the following of Adam, “ as the Pelagians do vainly talk; but it is the fault and “ corruption of the nature of every man that naturally is “ engendered of the offspring of Adam; whereby man is

^s *Constit. Apostol.* l. vii. c. 41. γέννητον, μόνον ἀληθινὸν Θεόν,
Πιστεύω καὶ βαπτίζομαι εἰς ἕνα ἁ- κ. τ. λ.

“ very far gone from original righteousness, and is of his
 “ own nature inclined to evil, so that the flesh lusteth
 “ always contrary to the spirit; and therefore in every
 “ person born into this world it deserveth God’s wrath
 “ and damnation. And this infection of nature doth re-
 “ main, yea, in them that are regenerated, whereby the
 “ lust of the flesh, called in Greek *Φρονήμα σαρκός*, which
 “ some do expound the wisdom, some the sensuality,
 “ some the affection, and some the desire of the flesh, is
 “ not subject to the law of God. And although there is
 “ no condemnation for them that believe and are bap-
 “ tized, yet the Apostle doth confess that concupiscence
 “ and lust hath of itself the nature of sin.”

The doctrine of Original Sin became the subject of controversy at the end of the fourth, or beginning of the fifth century. Pelagius then openly professed, that Adam would have died, though he had never offended, that his sin was merely personal, that his posterity derive no corruption from his fall, but that they are born in the same state in which he was created.

Against this heresy the first part of this Article is directed.

In the latter part there is some difference between our Church and the Romanists: they say that original sin is taken away by baptism; we say that “the infection” remains after baptism.

All those who are opposed to Infant Baptism must necessarily deny the doctrine of Original Sin.

The Article may be divided into the following propositions.—There is Original Sin.—It does not consist in the following or imitating of Adam.—It consists in the corruption of our nature.—This

corruption we derive from our first parents.—We are liable to God's wrath for it.—And it remains even in regenerate Christians.

It does not seem necessary to support each proposition separately; but the whole may be taken together, and the reader will easily discover which passages are applicable to the several points.

In the following passages Clemens Romanus speaks of that pollution which all that are born into this world are tainted with:

“Moreover of Job it is thus written; ‘Job was just and blameless, true, one that feared God, and abstained from all evil.’ But he condemns himself, and says, ‘There is none free from pollution,’ no, though his life be but of the length of one day^a.”

In the Septuagint translation used in the time of Clement the words of Job were thus translated; our version is, “Who can bring a clean thing out of an unclean? not one^b.”

Again, “Let us consider, therefore, brethren, whereof we were made; who and what kind of persons we entered into this world; as it were, out of a sepulchre, and out of darkness. He that made and formed us, brought us into his own world, having prepared for us his benefits before we were born^c.”

^a CLEM. Rom. Ep. 1^a. ad Corinth. c. 17. Ἐτι δὲ καὶ περὶ Ἰώβ οὕτω γέγραπται, Ἰώβ ἦν δίκαιος καὶ ἀμεμπτος, ἀληθινός, θεοσεβής, ἀπιχόμενος ἀπὸ παντὸς κακοῦ. Ἄλλ’ αὐτὸς ἑαυτοῦ κατηγορῶν λέγει· Οὐδεὶς καθαρὸς ἀπὸ ῥύπου, οὐδὲ εἰ μίᾳς ἡμέρας ἢ ζωῇ αὐτοῦ.

^b Job xiv. 4.

^c CLEM. ibid. c. 38. Ἀναλογισώμεθα οὖν, ἀδελφοί, ἐκ ποίας ὕλης ἐγεννήθημεν, ποῖοι καὶ τίνες εἰσέλθομεν εἰς τὸν κόσμον, ὡς ἐκ τοῦ τάφου καὶ σκότους.—

Justin Martyr speaks of original sin as different from the actual sins of each individual; “And we know that he did not go to the river Jordan, as having himself any need of being baptized, or of the Spirit’s coming upon him in the form of a dove; as neither did he submit to be born and to be crucified, as having any need of these things, but for the sake of the human race, which by Adam had fallen under death and the guile of the serpent, besides the particular cause which each man had for the sins he had committed^d.”

I have ventured to depart from Wall’s translation in the last few words; he has rendered it, “besides the particular cause which each man had of sinning.” The passage seems to me to express very strongly the doctrine of our second Article, that Christ came “to be a sacrifice, not only for original guilt, but also for actual sins of men.”

“As in the beginning all of us were by our first parents brought into bondage through the obligation we were under to suffer death; so at length, by the latter Adam, all who from the beginning have been his disciples, being cleansed and washed from such things as are of a deadly nature, are permitted to enter into the life of God^e.”

“As we offended God in the first Adam, by not obeying his commandment; so we are reconciled

^d JUSTIN. *Dial. cum Tryph.* c. 88.—ἀλλ’ ἐπὲρ τοῦ γένους τοῦ τῶν ἀνθρώπων, ὃ ἀπὸ τοῦ Ἀδάμ ὑπὸ θάνατον καὶ πλάνην τὴν τοῦ ὄφως ἐπεπτῶκει, παρὰ τὴν ἰδίαν αἰτίαν ἐκάστου αὐτῶν πονηρευσαμένων.

^e IRENÆI *adv. Hæres.* l. iv. c. xxii. s. 1. Uti quemadmodum in initio per primos, omnes in servitutem redacti sumus debito mortis; sic in ultimo, etc.

in the second Adam, being made obedient even unto death. For we were debtors to none but him, whose commandment we had transgressed from the beginning^f.”

“Man is condemned to death for having tasted of one little tree, and thence proceed sins with their punishments; and now all perish, who have not known a single turf of Paradise^g.”

“Satan you speak of with all hatred, and despite, and detestation, who, we say, is the angel of wickedness, the worker of all error, the spoiler of the whole world, by whom man at the beginning, being beguiled to transgress the commandment of God, was therefore given up to death; thence the whole race, sprung from the same seed, being tainted, derived also their own condemnation^h.”

“So there is almost no being born clean, that is to say, of heathens. For hence the Apostle saysⁱ, that from either parent sanctified, the children that are born are holy: as well by the prerogative of the seed, as by their education: else, he says, were they unclean. Meaning, however, to be understood that the children of the faithful are designed for holiness, and thereby for salva-

^f Idem, *ibid.* l. v. c. xvi. s. 3. —Deum, quem in primo quidem Adam offendimus, non facientes ejus præceptum; in secundo autem Adam reconciliati sumus, obediētes usque ad mortem facti—.

^g TERTULL. *adv. Marcion.* l. i. c. 22. Homo damnatur in mortem, ob unius arbusculæ de-

libationem, et exinde proficiunt delicta cum pœnis, et pereunt jam omnes, qui paradisi nullum cespitem noverunt.

^h Idem *de Testim. Animæ*, c. 3.—exinde totum genus de suo semine infectum, suæ etiam damnationis traducem fecit.

ⁱ 1 Cor. vii. 14.

tion; that by a pledge of such hope he might plead for those marriages which he would have to be continued. Otherwise he remembered our Lord's determination, 'except a man be born of water and of the Spirit, he cannot enter into the kingdom of God^k;' that is, he shall not be holy. Thus every soul is so long reckoned in Adam, until it be anew enrolled in Christ; and so long unclean, until it be so enrolled; and sinful, because unclean, receiving a taint from the fellowship of the flesh^l."

"It is our own will, when we will evil, contrary to the will of God, who wills that which is good. Moreover if you ask whence that will comes, by which we will any thing against the will of God; I will tell you—from ourselves; and not without reason, for you must necessarily resemble your origin; since Adam, the author both of our race and of sin, willed that which he sinned^m."

"Every one that entereth into this world is said to be affected with a certain contamination; and therefore the Scripture saith, 'There is none clean from filth, though he be but one day old.' Upon this very account, therefore, because he is placed in his mother's womb, and because he de-

^k John iii. 5.

^l TERTULL. *de Animâ* c. 39, 40.—Ita omnis anima eousque in Adam censetur, donec in Christo recenseatur; et tamdiu immunda, quamdiu recenseatur; peccatrix autem quia immunda, recipiens iguominiam ex carnis societate.

^m Idem *de Exhort. Casti-*

tat. c. 2.—Porro si quæris, unde veniat ista voluntas, quâ quid volumus adversus Dei voluntatem. Dicam, ex nobis ipsis; nec temere; semini enim tuo respondeas necesse esse. Si quidem ille princeps generis et delicti Adam voluit quod deliquit.

rives the materials of his body from the origin of his father's seed, he may be said to be contaminated in his father and mother ⁿ."

And Origen, in another passage, which will be found under the twenty-seventh Article, says, that original sin is the reason why infants are baptized.

"And also in the law it is commanded that a sacrifice be offered for every child that is born; 'a pair of turtle doves, or two young pigeons; of which one is for a sin-offering, the other for a burnt offering °.' For what sin is this one pigeon offered? Can the child that is new born have committed any sin? It has even then sin, for which the sacrifice is commanded to be offered; from which every one is denied to be free, though his life be but of one day. Of this sin David must be thought to have spoken that which we mentioned before, 'in sin did my mother conceive me;' for in the history there is no particular sin of his mother's related ^p."

Origen's testimony to the doctrine of original sin is equally strong, though he was mistaken in his proof; and supposed that the sin-offering was made on account of the sin of the child, whereas in fact it was that the mother might be made clean.

ⁿ ORIGEN. in *Lev. Hom.* xii. s. 4. Omnis qui ingreditur hunc mundum in quâdam contaminatione effici dicitur: propter quod et Scriptura dicit, "Nemo mundus a sorde, etc."

° Levit. xii. 8.

^p ORIGEN. *Com. in Ep. ad*

Rom. l. v. c. 9.—Pro quo peccato offertur hic pullus unus? numquid nuper editus parvulus peccare potuit? Et tunc habet peccatum, pro quo hostia jubetur offerri, à quo mundus negatur quis esse etsi unius diei fuerit vita ejus.—

Cyprian quotes the same verse from Job, which Clement of Rome had done before him, in proof of original guilt :

“ That no one is without pollution and sin, appears from what Job says, ‘ Who can bring a clean thing out of an unclean ? Not one !’ And from Psalm li. 5. ‘ Behold, I was shapen in iniquity ; and in sin did my mother conceive me ?’ And from 1 John i. 8. ‘ If we say that we have no sin, we deceive ourselves, and the truth is not in us ^q.’ ”

Fidus a country bishop sent a letter to a provincial council of bishops, who met at Carthage, desiring their resolution on two questions, one of which was ; whether an infant might be baptized before it was eight days old ; in the answer, which I shall have occasion to refer to again under the twenty-seventh Article, is the following passage, relating to our present subject :

“ But if moreover remission of sins is granted to the greatest offenders, and such as have before sinned very much against God, when they have afterwards believed, and no one is kept back from baptism and grace ; how much more ought not an infant to be forbidden it, who being newly born hath committed no sin, except that being carnally born according to Adam, it hath contracted in its first nativity the contagion of the old death ? Who cometh to the remission of sins on this very

^q CYPRIAN. *Testim. ad* apud Job : ‘ Quis enim mundus Quirin. l. iii. c. 54. Neminem à sordibus,’ etc.
sine sorde et sine peccato esse

account the more easily, that not its own but another's sins are remitted to it^r."

Athanasius, speaking of Christ's being born of the Virgin Mary, says; "Having thus taken a body from our race, because all men were subject to the corruption of death, giving it to death for all men, he offered it to the Father; doing this mercifully; that all men, as it were dying in him, the law respecting the corruption of man, might be abolished^s."

And in another place, "That as Adam sinning, the sin descended to all men, so the Lord conquering, that his conquest at last comes to us^t."

Hilary says; "For who can glory that he hath a chaste heart before God, nay though he be an infant of one day old, seeing, according to the Apostle, both the origin and law of sin remain in us^u."

Cyril of Jerusalem, in the following passage, mentions that the 'infection of nature remains in them that are regenerated;'

"We must give an account to the Lord of all the things done in the body. Say not, 'no one sees

^r Idem, *Ep. lix. ad Fidum.* c. 4.—infans, qui recens natus nihil peccavit, nisi quòd secundum Adam carnaliter natus contagium mortis antiquæ primâ nativitate contraxit?—

^s ATHANAS. *de Incarnat. Verb.* s. 8. tom. i. p. 54.—ἵνα ὡς μὲν πάντων ἀποθανόντων ἐν αὐτῷ, λυθῇ ὁ κατὰ τῆς φθορᾶς τῶν ἀνθρώπων νόμος.—

^t Idem, c. *Arian. Orat. ii.*

s. 6. "Ὅσπερ γὰρ τοῦ Ἀδὰμ παραβάντος εἰς πάντας τοὺς ἀνθρώπους ἡ ἀπάτη διέβη· οὕτω κ. τ. λ.

^u HILAR. *in Ps. lviii. Enarr.* s. 4. Quis enim gloriabitur castum se habere cor coram Deo, nec si unius diei fuerit infans, manente in nobis etiam secundum Apostolum et origine et lege peccati?

me,' nor think that there is no witness of what you do; oftentimes indeed no man does see you; but the Creator, an unerring and faithful witness dwells in heaven, and beholds whatever is done: and the stains of sin remain in the body; for as when the body has been wounded, although the wound be cured, the scar nevertheless remains; so likewise sin wounds the soul and the body, and the marks of the scars remain in all men; and they are taken away from those only who receive the washing of baptism; God by means of baptism heals the former wounds of soul and body; but for the future we must all with one accord secure ourselves, so that keeping the garment of this our body clean, we may not, by even slight fornication or wantonness, or the commission of any other sin, lose our heavenly salvation; but that we may inherit the eternal kingdom of God, of which may God make us all worthy by his grace ^x."

"Here is mercy without judgment, for he did not come to judge the world, but to save the world; but there will not be judgment without mercy, because there cannot be a man found that is clear from filth though it be his birth day ^y."

"Not to sin at all, God hath ordained it as a privilege above the human nature ^z."

^x CYRIL. HIEROS. *Catech.*
18.—καὶ οἱ σπῖλοι δὲ τῶν ἀμαρ-
τιῶν μένουσι τῇ σώματι—καὶ
μένουσι οἱ τύποι τῶν ἥλων ἐν
παῖσι.—

^y BASIL in *Ps.* xxxii. s. 4.
—διὰ τὸ μὴ δύνασθαι ἄνθρωπον κα-

θαρὸν εὐρεθῆναι ἀπὸ ρύπου, μηδὲ
εἰν μία ἡμέρα ἢ τῆς γενέσεως αὐτοῦ.

^z GREG. NAZ. *Orat.* iv. in
Jul. ii. Τὸ παντελῶς ἀναμάρτη-
τον ὑπὲρ τὴν ἀνθρωπίνην φύσιν
ἔταξεν ὁ Θεός.

“Who is he that lends out sin, but the Devil? From whom Eve having borrowed sin, by the usury of obnoxious succession, lent it out again to all mankind ^a.”

“In that thou confessest thou offendest, in this thou hast common fellowship with all, for none is without sin; to deny this is sacrilege ^b.”

It is well known that Augustine was the great opponent of the Pelagian heresy, from its earliest rise; his opinions, as well those that were published before, as those that were declared after, the commencement of the Pelagian controversy, are fully and clearly collected in Wall on Infant Baptism, so far at least as they bear on his subject; a few passages may be here adduced shewing his opinions on original sin, and the infection of nature that remains even after baptism.

“For as infants do not imitate Christ because they cannot, and yet may belong to his spiritual grace, so without the imitation of the first man, yet they are bound with the infection of being begotten carnally of him ^c.”

And so Augustine says that this infection remains after baptism:

“Let it not be thought that we should say that lust is sanctified, with which the regenerate them-

^a AMBROSE in *Tob.* c. ix.—
A quo Eva mutuata peccatum
obnoxie successionis usuris de-
feneravit omne genus huma-
num.

^b Idem, in *Ps.* cxviii. Quòd
lapsus fateris, in eo tibi cum
omnibus commune consortium,

quia nemo sine peccato; negare
hoc sacrilegium.

^c AUGUST. c. *Jul. Pelag.*
l. vi. c. 12.—ita sine imitatione
primi hominis, contagione ta-
men ex ipso carnalis genera-
tionis obstricti sunt.

selves are forced to conflict in a certain intestine war, as with an enemy, and to desire and pray to be healed from that plague ^d."

And again, "So long as thou livest, sin will necessarily be in thy members; but howsoever, let the dominion of it be taken away, let it not be obeyed in what it commands ^e."

"Is all iniquity blotted out (in baptism?) Doth no infirmity remain? If no infirmity remained, we might live without sin. But who can say this, unless he be proud? Unless unworthy of the mercy of the Redeemer? Unless he will deceive himself, and be one in whom there is no truth ^f?"

"Though in that we are born of God, we cannot commit sin; yet there is still that in us, that we are born of Adam, because death is not yet swallowed up in victory, which also is promised in the resurrection of our bodies, that we may be altogether blessed, and spotless, and uncorrupt ^g."

^d Idem, *ibid.*, c. 6. Absit ut dicamus sanctificari (concupiscentiam) cum quâ necesse habent regenerati, si non in vacuum Dei gratiam susceperunt, intestino quodam bello tanquam cum hoste configere, et ab eâ peste desiderare et optare sanari.

^e Idem, in *Job. Tract.* 41. Quamdiu vivis, peccatum necesse est esse in membris tuis.

^f Idem, *ibid.* Numquid quia deleta est tota iniquitas?

Nulla remansit infirmitas? Si non remansisset, sine peccato hic viveremus. Quis autem audeat hoc dicere, nisi superbus? Nisi misericordiâ liberatoris indignus? Nisi qui seipsum vult decipere, et in quo veritas non est?

^g AUGUST. in *Ep. ad Parmen.* l. ii. c. 7. Quamvis enim in quantum ex Deo nati sumus non peccemus, inest tamen adhuc quòd ex Adam nati sumus.—

ARTICLE X.

Of Free Will.

“THE condition of man after the fall of Adam is such, that he cannot turn and prepare himself by his own natural strength and good works to faith and calling upon God. Wherefore we have no power to do good works pleasant and acceptable to God, without the grace of God by Christ preventing us, that we may have a good will, and working with us when we have that good will.”

This Article opposes two contrary errors; first that of the Pelagians, who, as a consequence of their tenets respecting original sin, maintained that men are capable by their own natural strength of reaching the highest degrees of piety and virtue, and therefore denied any necessity of the inward assistance of the Holy Spirit. On the other hand, the Antinomians held grace to be irresistible, and as a consequence, all human endeavours to be unnecessary.

The meaning of the Article, and such was the unvarying doctrine of the primitive Fathers until Augustine perhaps, in his zeal against Pelagius, made use of expressions which, if taken simply and without any view to the controversy in which he was engaged, might be urged in favour of the

doctrine of irresistible grace ;—but the meaning of the Article appears to me to be this, that without impeaching the free will which God has given us, we cannot do good works *pleasant and acceptable to God* without preventing and assisting grace : here works “pleasant and acceptable to God,” are put in opposition to natural works, which we can do, but which are not “pleasant to God” as our thirteenth Article asserts, “forasmuch as they spring not of faith in Jesus Christ.” With a view to illustrate this distinction, my first extract shall be from one of the Apostolic Fathers, who uses expressions almost the same as in this Article :

“Let us consider what is good, and what is pleasing and acceptable in the sight of him who made us. Let us look steadfastly to the blood of Christ, and see how precious is his blood with God, which, being shed for our salvation, hath obtained the grace of repentance for the whole world^a.”

Clemens thus considered works to be pleasing to God, not for any intrinsic merit which they had, but for Christ’s sake, they being done through faith in him. And again, having exhorted those whom he addressed, to the exercise of all Christian virtues, he says “But all these things faith which is in Christ must confirm ; for so he himself exhorts us by the Holy Spirit ; ‘Come ye children,

^a CLEM. ROM. Ep. 1^a. ad Corinth. s. 7.—Ἀτενίσωμεν εἰς τὸ αἷμα τοῦ Χριστοῦ, καὶ ἴδωμεν ὅτι διὰ τὴν ἡμετέραν σωτηρίαν ἐκχυθὲν, παντὶ τῷ κόσμῳ μετανοίας χάριν ὑπήνεγκεν.
ὡς ἔστι τίμιον τῷ Θεῷ αἷμα αὐτοῦ,

hearken unto me, and I will teach you the fear of the Lord ^b.” Our author continues his extracts to the end of the seventeenth verse.

Then, towards the end of the Epistle, he says ; “ Let him that is pure in the flesh, not be proud of it, knowing that it is another who gives him continence ^c.”

Ignatius is insisting on the reality of Christ’s suffering, etc., and warns the Christians of Smyrna against false teachers :

“ But I caution you against wild beasts in the form of men ; whom you must not only not receive, but, if it be possible, not even meet with, but only pray for them, if by any means they may repent, which however is difficult. But of this Jesus Christ who is our true life, has the power. For if in appearance only these things were done by our Lord, then I too am bound only in appearance. Why then have I given up myself to death, to fire, to the sword, to wild beasts ?—Near the sword, near God ; in the midst of wild beasts, in the midst of God. Only in the name of Jesus Christ, in order that I may suffer with him, do I endure these things ; he who was made perfect man giving me power to do so ^d.”

And in a subsequent section he says ; “ Being

^b Idem, s. 22. Ταῦτα δὲ πάντα βεβαιῶ ἢ ἐν Χριστῷ πίστις.

^c Idem, s. 38. Ὁ ἄγνός ἐν τῇ σαρκὶ καὶ μὴ ἀλαζονεύεσθω, γινώσκων ὅτι ἕτερός ἐστιν ὁ ἐπιχορηγῶν αὐτῷ τὴν ἐγκράτειαν.

^d IGNAT. *ad Smyrn.* s. 4.—

μόνον δὲ προσεύχεσθαι ὑπὲρ αὐτῶν, εἰάν πῶς μετανοήσωσιν, ὅπερ δύσκολον. Τούτου δὲ ἔχει ἐξουσίαν Ἰησοῦς Χριστὸς, τὸ ἀληθινὸν ἡμῶν ζῆν.—αὐτοῦ με ἐνδυναμοῦντος τοῦ τελείου ἀνθρώπου γενομένου.

perfect, think also the things that are perfect ; for God is ready to assist you who desire to do well ^e.”

“Do you think, O men, that we could understand these things, except we have received the grace of understanding by his will who willed these things ? that that also which was spoken in the time of Moses might come to pass ^f ; ‘ They provoked him to jealousy with strange Gods, with abominations provoked they him to anger, etc ^g.’” to the end of the twenty-third verse, containing the prophecy of the admission of the Gentiles into the Church.

“Wherefore the Lord himself, who is Emmanuel from the Virgin, is the sign of our salvation ; because it was the Lord himself who saved them, for they were able to do nothing towards saving themselves. And therefore St. Paul, speaking of man’s infirmity, says, ‘ I know that in my flesh dwelleth no good thing ^h,’ shewing that the meritorious cause of our salvation is not from ourselves but from God. And again, ‘ O wretched man that I am : Who shall deliver me from the body of this death ⁱ ?’ And then he comes to mention his deliverer ; ‘ I thank God, through Jesus Christ our Lord ^k ^l.’”

^e Idem, *ibid*, s. 11.—Θέλουσιν γὰρ ὑμῖν ἐνπράσσειν Θεὸς ἔτοιμος εἰς τὸ παρασχεῖν.

^f Deut. xxxii. 16. etc.

^g JUSTIN. *Dial. cum Tryph.* c. 119.—εἰ μὴ θελήματι τοῦ θελήσαντος αὐτὰ ἐλάβομεν χάριν τοῦ νοῆσαι.—

^h Rom. vii. 18.

ⁱ Ibid, v. 24.

^k Ibid, v. 25.

^l IRENÆI *adv. Hæres.* l. iii. c. xx. s. 3. Propter hoc ergo signum salutis nostræ illud, qui ex Virgine Emmanuel, est ipse Dominus : quoniam ipse

Clemens of Alexandria also shews the existence of free will, and the necessity of grace :

On these words “ If thou wilt be perfect ^m,” he remarks: “ He was not therefore yet perfect, for nothing is more than perfect. And the expression ‘if thou wilt,’ shewed, upon divine authority, the free will of the mind, which was conversing with him. For the choice was in the man, as being free; but the gift is in God, as Lord. But he gives to those who are willing, and strive, and pray, that thus their salvation may be their own. For God does not compel. For force is repugnant to God; but he gives to those who seek, he supplies those who ask, he opens to those who knock ⁿ.”

“ A corrupt tree will not produce good fruit, unless it be grafted; and a good tree ^o will produce corrupt fruit, if it be not cultivated. And stones will be made the sons of Abraham ^p, if they are formed into the faith of Abraham. And the offspring of vipers ^q will produce the fruit of repentance, if they have spit out the malignant poison of their nature. This will be the effect of divine grace, more powerful truly than nature, having subjected to itself the power of free will that is in us, (which is called *αὐτεξούσιον*.) And since that

Dominus erat qui salvabat eos, quia per semetipsos non habebant salvari. Et propter hoc Paulus infirmitatem hominis annuntians, ait: *Scio* etc.

^m Matt. xix. 21.

ⁿ CLEM. ALEX. *Quis dives*

salvetur. c. 10.—ἐπὶ τῷ ἀνθρώπῳ γὰρ ἦν ἡ αἵρεσις, ὡς ἐλευθέρῳ· ἐπὶ Θεῷ δὲ ἡ δόσις, ὡς Κυρίῳ.—

^o Luke, vi. 43.

^p Matt. iii. 9.

^q Ibid, 7.

power is both natural and mutable, whithersoever it is turned, our nature is turned with it. But that this free will (*τὸ αὐτεξούσιον*) is in us by nature, I have already shewn to Marcion and Hermogenes ^r."

The following seems to be the passage in his work against Marcion, which is above referred to. He has been answering objections made to the goodness, foreknowledge, and power of God; Marcion it would appear had objected, that if God was perfectly good, he could not have been willing that evil should come into the world; if he had perfect foreknowledge, he must have foreseen it, and if his power was Almighty, he might have prevented it: Tertullian, having shewn that God must be perfectly good, and have perfect foreknowledge and power, proceeds; "If therefore God had those attributes, from which no evil either could or ought to have happened to man, and evil nevertheless did happen; let us also consider the condition of man, whether or not that, which could not happen through God's means, has not rather happened through means of that. I find that man was created by God free in will and power; for I can perceive no image and likeness of God in him, except the form of the same state. For in his features and corporeal lineaments, which are so varied in the human race, man has not been fashioned in the likeness of God, who is uniform, but in that substance, which he derived

^r TERTULL *de Animâ*, c. 21. in nobis subjacentem sibi liberam arbitrii potestatem, quod
—Hæc erit vis divinæ gratiæ, potentior utique naturâ, habens *αὐτεξούσιον* dicitur.—

from God himself, that is, the soul, which answers to the form of God, he has been stamped with freedom and power of will. This condition of his moreover the law itself, then laid down by God, confirmed. For a law would not be imposed on one, who had it not in his own power to pay that obedience which the law required : nor again would a threat of death be affixed to disobedience, unless the contempt of the law was imputed to man as the act of his own free will^a.”

“ Except the Lord build the house, their labour is but lost that build it. Except the Lord keep the city, the watchman waketh but in vain.” Psalm cxxvii. 1, 2.

Origen in his comment on these verses give us a plain illustration of both preventing and assisting grace.

“ He builds the house, whosoever progresses, and he keeps the city, whosoever is perfect ; but vain is the labour of the builder, and vain the watching of the watchman, except the Lord build, and the Lord keep. The power of the Lord which assists in the building of him that buildeth, and which helps him to build who is not able of himself to complete the building, is a good beyond our own free choice : and the same must be thought about the city that is kept. And as if I should say that the good in agriculture, which causes the fruit to grow, is mixed of that freedom of choice which is in the art of the farmer, and of that which is not in

^a Idem *adv. Marcion.* l. ii. c. 5.—*Liberum et sui arbitrii et suæ potestatis invenio hominem à Deo institutum*——

his free choice but from Providence, that is to say, the temperature of the atmosphere, and the supply of sufficient rain; so the good of the reasonable creature is mixed, of his own free will, and the divine power assisting with him that chooses the things that are most honest. Therefore, in order to be honest and good, there is not only need of our own free choice, and the divine assistance, which as far as we are concerned is not in our own choice; but this is also necessary, that he who has become honest and good, should persevere in virtue. Since he that has been made perfect, will fall again, if he is over-elated with his honesty, and claims the merit to himself, and does not pay the honour that is due to Him, who has contributed much more to the acquirement and support of his virtue^t."

And a little further on he continues, "Perhaps the holy Apostle, seeing that our free will contributed much less than the power of God to the attainment of good things, said that the end is not of him that wills, nor of him that runs, but of God who has mercy^u. Not as if God had pity on those who did not will or who did not run, but as if the willing and the running were nothing in comparison of the mercy of God, and therefore that it was fit-

^t ORIGEN. *Select. in Psalm.* tom. ii. p. 570, 571. — οὕτω τὸ τοῦ λογικοῦ ἀγαθὸν μικτόν ἐστιν ἔκ τε τῆς προαιρέσεως αὐτοῦ, καὶ τῆς συμπνεύσεως θείας δυνάμεως τῷ τὰ κάλλιστα προελομένῳ· οὐ μόνον τοίνυν, εἰς τὸ καλὸν καὶ ἀγα-

θὸν γενέσθαι, χρεῖα καὶ τῆς προαιρέσεως τῆς ἡμετέρας καὶ τῆς θείας συμπνεύσεως, ἥτις ἐστὶν ὡς πρὸς ἡμᾶς ἀπροαίρετος· ἀλλὰ καὶ εἰς τὸ γενόμενον καλὸν καὶ ἀγαθὸν διαμεῖναι ἐν τῇ ἀρετῇ. —

^u Rom. ix. 16.

ting the good should be ascribed rather to the mercy of God, than to human willing or running^x."

"Human weakness is incompetent to obtain any thing of itself; and this only is the duty of its nature, that it should be willing to begin to form itself into the family of God. It belongs to the mercy of God to assist those who are willing, to confirm those who begin, to receive those who come. But the beginning is from ourselves, that he may perfect it^y."

"It belongs to me to speak, to you to give attention, to God to make perfect. Let us strengthen our minds, let us brace up our soul, let us prepare our heart. The race is for life; the hope is for everlasting things. God, who knows our hearts, and discerns who is sincere and who is a hypocrite, is able to preserve the sincere, and to make the hypocrite faithful. For God is able to make even the unbeliever a believer, if he will but give his heart^z."

"Even if you have no faith, or have but little faith, the Lord is merciful, and assists you, if you

^x Idem, *ibid.* Τάχα γοῦν ἐρῶν ὁ ἱερός Ἀπόστολος πολὺ ἔλαττον τὸ ἡμέτερον προαιρετικὸν τῆς τοῦ Θεοῦ δυνάμεως πρὸς τὴν κτῆσιν τῶν ἀγαθῶν, φησὶ, τὸ τέλος, κ. τ. λ.

^y HILAR. *Tr.* in Ps. cxviii. lib. xvi. s. 10. Hoc tantum naturæ suæ officium est, ut aggregare in familiam Dei et velit et cæperit. Divinæ misericordiæ est, ut volentes adjuvet, incipientes confirmet, adeuntes recipiat: ex nobis autem initium est, ut ille perficiat.

^z CYRIL. *Hieros. Præfat. Catech.* p. fin. Ἐν ἐμοὶ γάρ ἐστι τὸ εἰπεῖν, ἐν σοὶ δὲ τὸ προσθέσθαι, ἐν Θεῷ δὲ τὸ τελειῶσαι——Δυνατὸς δὲ ὁ Θεὸς ὁ τὰς καρδίας ἡμῶν εἰδῶς, καὶ γινώσκων τὶς μὲν ἐστι δίκαιος, τὶς δὲ ὑποκριτής, τὸν μὲν γνήσιον φυλάξαι, τὸν δὲ ὑποκριτὴν πιστοποιῆσαι· δύναται γὰρ ὁ Θεὸς καὶ τὸν ἄπιστον πιστοποιῆσαι, ἐὰν μόνον δῶ τὴν καρδίαν.

repent. Only say yourself, with a proper feeling, ‘Lord I believe ; help thou mine unbelief^a.’ If you think that you believe, but have not yet the perfection of faith, you must say with the Apostles ‘Lord, increase our faith^b.’ For you have something from yourself, but you receive much from Him^c.”

“You see, because the power of God every where cooperates with the endeavours of man, that nobody can build a house without the Lord, nobody can keep a city without the Lord, nobody can begin any thing without the Lord^d.”

Again ; “The good Lord requires exertion, he supplies strength^e.”

Chrysostom, having observed that Noah was enabled by God’s grace to go through those trials to which he was exposed during the deluge, thus exhorts his hearers :

“Let us also, I beseech you, imitate this righteous man, and let us earnestly endeavour to do what is in our power, to make ourselves worthy of those gifts that are from God. For on this account he waits for occasions from us, that he may manifest his exceeding bounty. Let us not therefore by our indolence deprive ourselves of those gifts that are from Him, but let us hasten and press onwards to lay hold of the beginning, and to enter into that way that leads to virtue, that being aided by

^a Mark ix, 24.

^b Luke xvii. 5.

^c Idem, *Catech.* 5, —τὸ μὲν γὰρ τὶ παρά σεαυτοῦ ἔχεις, τὸ δὲ τὶ παρ’ ἐκείνου πολὺ λαμβάνεις.

^d AMBROSE, in *Luc.* lib. ii.

s. 84. *ed. Bened.* tom. i. p. 1309. Vides itaque quia ubique Domini virtus studiis cooperatur humanis ; ut nemo possit ædificare sine Domino.—

^e Idem, p. 1394.

assistance from above, we may be enabled to persevere even unto the end: for it is not possible for us to do any good thing rightly without we are assisted by strength from above^f.”

And speaking of Jacob's prosperity in his service with Laban, he says:

“For although he was aided by assistance from above, yet he first did all that was in his own power. So also let us persuade ourselves, that although we incessantly strive with all our might, we shall not be able to do any thing as it ought to be done, unless we be assisted by strength from above. For as, if we do not obtain assistance from thence, we have it not in our power to do any of the things that we ought to do, rightly; so on the other hand, if we do not contribute what in us lies, we shall not be able to obtain strength from above^g.”

“Man, from the beginning of his condition has God as an assistant; and since it was of his grace that he was created, and it is of his mercy that he subsists and lives, he can do no good work without him, who has so granted free will, that he did not refuse his grace in any single work^h.”

^f CHRYSOST. in *Cap. vii. Genes. Homil. xxv.* — οὐδὲ γὰρ οἷόν τ' ἐστὶ χρῆσθαι ἡμᾶς ποτε κατορθῶσαι μὴ τῆς ἄνωθεν ροπῆς ἀπολαύσαντας.

^g Idem, in *Cap. xxviii. Genes. Hom. lviii. p. fin.* — Οὕτω δὲ καὶ ἡμεῖς πείσωμεν ἑαυτοὺς, ὅτι κὰν μυριάκις σπουδάζωμεν, οὐδὲν οὐδέποτε κατορθῶσαι δυνησόμεθα, εἰ μὴ καὶ τῆς ἄνωθεν ροπῆς ἀπολαύσαιμεν. “Ὡσπερ γὰρ, εἰ μὴ τῆς ἐκείθεν

συμαχίας ἀπολαύσωμεν, οὐδὲν ἰσχύομέν ποτε τῶν δεόντων κατορθῶσαι· οὕτω πάλιν, εἰ μὴ τὰ παρ' ἑαυτῶν εἰσενέγκωμεν, οὐ δυνησόμεθα τῆς ἄνωθεν ἀξιοῦσθαι ροπῆς.”

^h HIERON. *Ep. Crit. ad Cypr. Presb. tom. ii. p. 696. ed. Bened.* Homo à principio conditionis suæ Deo utitur adiutore: et quum illius sit gratiæ quod creatus est, illiusque misericordiæ quod subsistit et

“ It is therefore agreed between us, that in good works after our own will, we depend on the assistance of God ; in bad works upon that of the devilⁱ. ”

“ Neither doth a man begin to be converted or changed from evil to good by the beginnings of faith, unless the free and undeserved mercy of God work it in him^k. ”

And shortly afterwards ; “ So therefore let the grace of God be accounted of, that from the beginning of his good conversion to the end of his perfection, he that glorieth, should glory in the Lord. Because as none can perfect a good work without the Lord, so none can begin it without the Lord^l. ”

“ The grace of God, by Jesus Christ our Lord, (which the true faith and catholic Church always holds) translates both small and great from the death of the first man unto the life of the second man, not only by blotting out their sins, but also by helping such as can use the liberty of the will not to sin, but to live holily ; so as that unless he do help, we can have no piety or righteousness in word nor in will : ‘ For it is God that worketh in us both to will and to do of his own good pleasure. ’

vivit, nihil boni operis agere potest absque eo, qui ita concessit liberum arbitrium, ut suam per singula opera gratiam non negaret.

^l Idem, *Dial. adv. Pelag.* l. i. tom. iv. pars 2^{da}. p. 486. Constat ergo inter nos, in bonis operibus post propriam voluntatem, Dei nos niti auxilio, in malis diaboli.

^k AUGUST. *c. duas Epist. Pelag.* lib. ii. c. 10. Nec omnino incipit homo ex malo in bonum per initium fidei commutari, nisi hoc in illo agat indebita et gratuita misericordia Dei.

ⁱ Idem, *ibid.*—Quia sicut nemo potest bonum perficere sine Domino, sic nemo incipere sine Domino.

For who but he that came to seek and to save that which was lost, can make any one differ from that mass of perdition? Wherefore the Apostle asketh the question saying: ‘For who made thee to differ?’ Where if any one say, my faith, my will, my good works, it is answered him, ‘For what hast thou that thou hast not received ^m.’”

“For it is certain that we may keep the commandments of God if we will; but because the will is prepared by the Lord, (it seems not by ourselves) we must ask of him that we may will as much as is sufficient, that willing we might do. It is certain that we do will when we will, but it is he that makes us that we will what is good ⁿ.”

And presently “It is certain that we act, when we act, but it is he that makes us to act, affording most effectual strength unto the will ^o.”

“The will is then truly free, when it serves neither vice nor sin. Such was given by God;

^m Idem, *Ep. clxxxvi.* (al. cvi.) *ad Paulinum.* s. 3. Quòd gratia Dei per Jesum Christum Dominum nostrum (quod fides vera et catholica tenet semper ecclesia) pusillos cum magnis à morte primi hominis ad vitam secundi hominis transfert, non solùm peccata delendo, verum etiam ad non peccandum recteque vivendum eos qui jam uti possunt voluntatis arbitrio, sic adjuvando, ut nisi adjuvet, nihil pietatis atque justitiæ sive in opere sive etiam in ipsâ voluntate habere possimus: “Deus quippe operatur in nobis etc?”

ⁿ AUGUST. *de Gratiâ et Libero Arbitrio ad Valentinum.* c. xvi. s. 32.—Certum est enim nos mandata servare si volumus: sed quia præparatur voluntas à Domino, ab illo petendum est ut tantum velimus quantum sufficit, ut volendo faciamus. Certum est nos velle, cùm volumus, sed ille facit ut velimus bonum.

^o Idem *ibid.* Certum est nos facere cùm facimus, sed ille facit ut faciamus præbendo vires efficacissimas voluntati.

and being lost by our own depravity, cannot be restored except by him who was able to give it. Accordingly Truth says, ‘If the Son shall make you free, you shall be free indeed.’ But that is the same, as if he said, ‘If the Son shall save you, then you shall be saved indeed. ^{p.}’”

ARTICLE XI.

Of the Justification of Man.

“WE are accounted righteous before God only for the merit of our Lord and Saviour Jesus Christ, by faith, and not for our own works or deservings; wherefore that we are justified by faith only, is a most wholesome doctrine, and very full of comfort, as more largely is expressed in the Homily of Justification.”

This Article is principally directed against the Popish doctrine of human merit. The Romanists however, contend that our doctrine of justification virtually accords with their own. They maintain the necessity of good works for justification, and also the necessity of faith; we on the other hand

^p Idem, *de Civitate Dei*. l. xiv. c. 11. Arbitrium voluntatis tunc est vere liberum, cum vitiis peccatisque non servit. Tale datum est à Deo: quod amissum proprio vitio, nisi à quo dari potuit, reddi non potest: etc.

say that we are justified by faith *only*, and our next Article asserts that good works are the fruits of faith, and follow *after* justification; so that we deny that works are in any way the *causes* of justification. This will be seen more clearly if we pay attention to the use of the word “only” in this Article, “we are justified by faith *only*;” now if we are justified by faith *only*, two things, works and faith, cannot be necessary for justification.

It may be also remarked as another consequence of the Pelagian heresy, that good works were by them considered meritorious, and the only conditions of salvation. The Anabaptists at the period of the Reformation revived this doctrine, and taught that men might deserve heaven by their own righteousness.

In addition to the question which most obviously arises out of this Article, viz. of justification by faith only, I shall take this opportunity of adducing passages from the Fathers on the doctrine of the Atonement, which was reserved in the Second Article for future consideration.

“Let us then hold fast to his blessing and let us consider what are the ways of blessedness. Let us look back upon those things that have happened from the beginning. For what was our father Abraham blessed? Was it not because that through faith he wrought righteousness and truth? Isaac with confidence knowing what was to come, cheerfully yielded himself up for a sacrifice. Jacob with humility departed out of his own country, fleeing from his brother and went unto Laban and

served him, and there was given unto him the sceptre of the twelve tribes of Israel.

“If any one will distinctly consider them one by one, he will understand the greatness of the gifts that were given by Him. For from him came the Priests and Levites, who all ministered at the altar of God. From him came our Lord Jesus according to the flesh. From him came the kings and princes and rulers in Judah. Nor were the rest of his tribes in any small glory; God having promised that “Thy seed shall be as the stars of heaven ^a.” They were all therefore greatly glorified and magnified, not for their own sake, or for their own works, or for the righteousness that they themselves wrought, but through his will. And we also being called by his will in Christ Jesus, are justified not by ourselves, neither by our own wisdom or knowledge, or piety, or the works which we have wrought in holiness of heart; but by that faith by which the Almighty God has justified all men from the beginning, to whom be glory for ever and ever, Amen ^b.”

Polycarp, quoting Ephes. ii. 8., says, “But believing ye shall rejoice with joy unspeakable, and full of glory, into which many desire to enter, knowing that ‘by grace ye are saved through

^a Genes. xviii. 17.

^b CLEM. ROM. *Ep. ad Corinth.* s. 31, 32.—Πάντες οὖν ἐδοξάσθησαν καὶ ἐμεγαλύνθησαν, οὐ δι’ αὐτῶν, ἢ τῶν ἔργων αὐτῶν, τῆς δικαιοπραγίας ἧς κατειργάσαντο, ἀλλὰ διὰ τοῦ θελήματος αὐτοῦ. Καὶ ἡμεῖς οὖν διὰ θελήματος αὐτοῦ ἐν

Χριστῷ Ἰησοῦ κληθέντες, οὐ δι’ ἐαυτῶν δικαιοῦμεθα, οὐδὲ διὰ τῆς ἡμετέρας σοφίας, ἢ συνέσεως, ἢ εὐσεβείας, ἢ ἔργων ὧν κατειργασάμεθα ἐν ὁσιότητι καρδίας· ἀλλὰ διὰ τῆς πίστεως, δι’ ἧς πάντας τοὺς ἀπ’ αἰῶνος ὁ παντοκράτωρ Θεὸς ἐδικαίωσεν.

faith,' not by works, but by the will of God, through Christ Jesus^c."

"The Lord was not unknown to Abraham, whose day he desired to see: neither was the Father of the Lord unknown to him; for he had learnt from the Word of the Lord, and believed in him: wherefore it was counted to him for righteousness^d by the Lord. For the faith, which is towards the most high God, justifieth man: and therefore he said; 'I have lift up mine hand unto the Lord, the most high God, the possessor of heaven and earth^e.' But all these things, they, who are of an evil mind, endeavour to overturn, on account of one saying, which they do not well understand^f."

"'For the just shall live by faith^g.' Now this doctrine 'that the just shall live by faith,' was foretold by the Prophets^h."

"Abraham was justified, not by works, but by faith; after the end of life, therefore, it will be of no benefit to men, even if they now do good works, unless they have faithⁱ."

Tertullian is speaking of remission of sins, and

^c POLYCARP. *Ep. ad Philip.* s. 1.—εἰδότες ὅτι χάριτί ἐστε σεσωσμένοι, οὐκ ἐξ ἔργων, ἀλλὰ θελήματι Θεοῦ, διὰ Ἰησοῦ Χριστοῦ.

^d Gen. xv. 6.

^e Gen. xiv. 22.

^f IRENÆI *adv. Hæres.* lib. iv. c. 5. s. 5.—Fides enim, quæ est ad Deum altissimum, justificat hominem.—

^g Rom. i. 17.

^h IRENÆI *adv. Hæres.* lib. iv. c. 34. s. 2.—Hoc autem, quoniam justus ex fide vivet, per Prophetas prædictum fuerat.

ⁱ CLEM. ALEX. *Strom.* lib. i. s. 7. p. 338.—'Αβραάμ δὲ, οὐκ ἐξ ἔργων ἐδικαιώθη, ἀλλ' ἐκ πίστεως. οὐδὲν οὖν ὄφελος αὐτοῖς μετὰ τὴν τελευτὴν τοῦ βίου, καὶ ἐνεργῶς ὡσι νῦν, εἰ μὴ πίστιν ἔχοιεν.

of the woman mentioned Luke vii. 38. who washed the feet of Jesus with her tears, and wiped them with the hairs of her head; and then remarks: "But if the incitement to repentance proceeded from her faith, through means of repentance, which was justified by faith, she heard these words, 'thy faith hath saved thee^k,' from him who had declared by the mouth of Habakkuk^l, 'the just shall live by faith.'^m"

Origen denies any merit to works; "I can scarcely persuade myself that there can be any work that can demand a recompense from God as a debt, seeing that our power to do, or think, or speak any thing, proceeds from his free gift and bountyⁿ."

"That it is faith alone which profits us; and that we are able to do in proportion as we believe, appears from the book of Genesis, where we find, that 'Abraham believed in God, and that it was counted to him for righteousness'^o."

And again, he says, "That the blessing which was given to Abraham belongs to us Christians also. For if Abraham believed in God, and it was

^k Luke vii. 50.

^l Habak. ii. 4.

^m TERTULL. *adv. Marcion.* lib. iv. c. 18.—Sed et in pœnitentiæ stimulus ex fide acciderat, per pœnitentiam ex fide justificatam, ab eo audiit, fides tua te salvam fecit, qui per Abacuc pronuntiavit, justus et fide suâ vivet.

ⁿ ORIGEN. *in Ep. ad Rom.* lib. iv. c. 1. Vix mihi suadeo

quòd possit ullum opus esse quod ex debito remunerationem Dei deposcat, cùm etiam hoc ipsum quòd agere aliquid possumus, vel cogitare, vel proloqui, ipsius dono et largitione faciamus.

^o CYPRIAN. *Testim. ad Quirin.* l. iii. c. 43.—Fidem in totum prodesse, et tantum nos posse, quantum credimus, in Genesi—

counted to him for righteousness, then whosoever believeth in God, and liveth by faith, is found righteous^p.”

“ Abraham was justified not by works only, but by faith also. For he did many things rightly, but he was never called the friend of God, except after he had believed. And every work of his was made perfect according to faith. Through faith he left his parents, through faith he left his native country, his place of residence, and his name. As therefore he was justified, be ye also justified^q.”

“ But this is the perfect and only glorying in God, when one is not lifted up with his own righteousness, but acknowledgeth that he wanteth the true righteousness, and that it is by faith only in Christ that he can be justified^r.”

“ Everlasting rest is laid up for them that strive lawfully in this present life, not to be given according to the debt of works, but exhibited according to the grace of the bountiful God, to such as hope in him^s.”

Ambrose upon these words, “ His faith was accounted unto him for righteousness,” says, “ He speaketh this, because without the works of the

^p Idem, *Ep. lxiii. s. 3. ad Cæcilium*.—Nam si Abraham Deo credidit, et deputatum est ei ad justitiam: utique quisquis Deo credit, et fide vivit, justus invenitur.

^q CYRIL. HIEROS. *Catech. 5.*—κατέλιπε γονέας διὰ πίστιν. κατέλιπε πατρίδα, καὶ χώραν καὶ οἰκίαν διὰ τὴν πίστιν ὥσπερ οὖν

ἐκεῖνος ἐδικαιώθη, καὶ σὺ δικαίωθητι.

^r BASIL. *Hom. xxii. de Hum. s. 3.*—πίστει δὲ μόνῃ τῇ εἰς Χριστὸν δεδικαιωμένοι.

^s Idem, in *Ps. cxiv. s. 5*—οὐ κατ' ὀφείλημα τῶν ἔργων ἀποδομένη, ἀλλὰ κατὰ χάριν τοῦ μεγαλοδώρου Θεοῦ, τοῖς εἰς αὐτὸν ἐλπικόσι παρεχομένη.

law to every sinner, that is, to every Gentile that believeth in Christ, his faith is counted to him for righteousness, as it was to Abraham. How, therefore, can the Jews think to be justified by the works of the law, and yet as Abraham was justified, when they see Abraham was not justified by the works of the law, but by faith only? There is no need, therefore, of the law, seeing a sinner is justified before God by faith only^t."

Chrysostom, speaking of Abraham, says,

"For what did he lose by not being under the law? Nothing; for faith alone was sufficient for his justification^u."

And Jerome; "The faith of Abraham was so great, that both all his old sins should be forgiven, and that it should be taught to be accepted for all righteousness^x."

"Abraham believed God, and it was counted to him for righteousness; and so will faith alone suffice you also for righteousness^y." And again,

"But because none is justified by the law, seeing no one keeps it, it is therefore said, that believers are to be justified by faith only^z."

At the conclusion of the second Article it was

^t AMBROS. in *Ep. ad Rom.*
4.—Non ergo opus est lege,
quando impius per solam fidem
justificatur apud Deum.

^u CHRYSOST. in *Ep. ad Gal.*
c. iii. v. 6.—ἀλλ' ἠρκεσεν ἡ πίστις
εἰς δικαιώσιν αὐτοῦ.

^x HIERON. in *Rom.* 4. Tam
magna fuit fides Abrahæ ut et

pristina ei peccata donarentur,
et sola pro omni justitiâ doce-
retur accepta.

^y Idem, in *Gal.* 3.—Ita et
vobis ad justitiam sola sufficit
fides.

^z Idem, *ibid.*—Ideo dictum
est quod solâ fide justificandi
essent credentes.

asserted that Christ suffered, “to reconcile his Father to us, and to be a sacrifice not only for original guilt, but also for actual sins of men.” The consideration of these words, which express the doctrine of the Atonement, was postponed, in order that the history of our Saviour, the reality of which is insisted on in the second, third, and fourth Articles, might not be interrupted. The present Article asserts that we are justified by faith only, in and through the merits of Jesus Christ: the doctrine of the Atonement may therefore be properly considered in this place. In one point of view this doctrine may be said to be opposed to the tenets of the Roman Church, as a belief in the necessity of an atoning sacrifice for the sins of all men, implies a denial of human merit; another point of difference between our Church and the Roman on this subject, will be noticed under the thirty-first Article.

The Socinians, however, are the chief opposers of this doctrine; they deny that the death of Christ was a sacrifice, maintaining that he suffered only to give men an example, and to furnish such a proof of his mission as could not be given by a common departure out of life^z.

The few following extracts (and they might be multiplied to the size of this volume) will clearly shew that the early Fathers considered the shedding of Christ’s blood to be a sacrifice, or atonement for the sins of mankind; or, as the Homily on Salva-

^z HEY, Appendix to Art. xi. s. 1.

tion expresses it, that “he for them paid their ransom by his death.”

Barnabas in a passage, part of which will be found under the second Article, says; “For this cause the Lord endured to give his body unto death, that we might be sanctified by the remission of sins, that is, by the sprinkling of his blood. For it is written concerning him partly to the people of the Jews, partly to us. But thus he speaks ‘He was wounded for our transgressions, he was bruised for our iniquities: with his stripes we are healed. He is brought as a lamb to the slaughter, and as a sheep before her shearers is dumb, so he opened not his mouth ^a.’^b”

Clemens Romanus says, “Let us look steadfastly to the blood of Christ and see how precious is his blood with God; which being shed for our salvation, has obtained the grace of repentance for the whole world ^c.”

And Ignatius, having spoken of Christ’s crucifixion, says; “By the fruit of which we are, even by his blessed passion; that he might set up a token for all ages, through his resurrection, unto his holy saints and faithful servants, whether amongst the Jews, or amongst the Gentiles, in one body of his Church. For all these things he

^a Isaiah, liii. 5—7.

^b BARNABÆ *Ep. Cathol.* s. 4. Propter hoc Dominus sustinuit tradere corpus suum in exterminium, ut remissione peccatorum sanctificemur, quod est sparsione sanguinis illius.

Scriptum est enim de illo, quædam ad populum Judæorum, quædam ad nos. Dicit autem sic. *Vulneratus est*, etc.

^c CLEM. ROM. *Ep.* 1^a. s. 7. ante, p. 157.

suffered for our sakes, that we might be saved^d." And in another place of the same Epistle, also before quoted^e, he calls "the passion," "our resurrection."

In two passages before given^f from Justin Martyr, he says that Christ suffered "for the salvation of those who believe in him." And in another place, "The Father of the universe was willing that his Christ should take the curses of all, for the whole human race^g."

He also says that Christ was given as a ransom for us :

"He gave his own Son a ransom for us, the holy for the wicked, him that was free from evil for the evil, the righteous for the unrighteous, the incorruptible for the corruptible, the immortal for the mortal; for what else was able to cover our sins, but his righteousness? Wherein is it possible for us wicked and impious creatures to be justified, except in the only Son of God? O sweet reconciliation, O untraceable ministry, O unlooked for blessings, that the wickedness of many should be hidden in one righteous man, and the righteousness of one justify many wicked^h."

Clemens of Alexandria says expressly, that Christ

^d IGNAT. *ad Smyrn.* s. 1. 2. The passage is given at length under the second Article, ante, p. 65, 66.

^e Ante, p. 52.

^f Ante, p. 66.

^g JUSTIN *Dial.* c. 95. εἰ οὖν καὶ τὸν ἑαυτοῦ Χριστὸν ὑπὲρ τῶν ἐκ παντὸς γένους ἀνθρώπων ὁ

Πατὴρ τῶν ὅλων τὰς πάντων κατάρως ἀναδείξασθαι ἐβουλήθη.—

^h Idem, *Ep. ad Diog.* c. 9. Αὐτὸς τὸν ἴδιον Ὑἱὸν ἀπέδοτο λύτρον ὑπὲρ ἡμῶν, τὸν ἅγιον ὑπὲρ ἀνόμων, τὸν ἄκακον ὑπὲρ τῶν κακῶν, τὸν δίκαιον ὑπὲρ τῶν ἀδίκων, τὸν ἄφθαρτον ὑπὲρ τῶν φθαρτῶν, τὸν ἀθάνατον ὑπὲρ τῶν θνητῶν.—

“gave himself a sacrifice for us ⁱ.” And Hippolytus, in a passage before quoted ^k, speaks of the redemption of our whole race by Christ’s suffering.

“You too are to be pitied, who do not acknowledge Christ to have been typified in the person of Moses, as an intercessor with the Father, and as offering his own life for the salvation of the people ^l.”

The testimony of Athanasius is full and clear ; “It was necessary that what was due from all should be paid ; for death was a debt due from all, as I have before mentioned. For this cause principally he came ; and on this account, after proof by deeds concerning his divinity, he offered a sacrifice for all, delivering up his temple to death instead of all, that he might make all released and free from the old transgression ^m.”

“By his death salvation came to all, and every creature was ransomed. He is the life of all, even he who like a sheep gave up his own body to death, as a ransom for the salvation of all ⁿ.”

“Since death came by one man, life also came by one man ; by one man, namely the Saviour, who voluntarily submitted to death. For remember what he said, ‘I have power to lay down my

ⁱ CLEM. ALEX. ante, p. 68.

^k HIPPOL. ante, p. 68.

^l TERTULL. *adv. Marcion.*
l. ii. c. 26.—et oblatorem animæ
suæ pro populi salute.

^m ATHANAS. *de Incarnat.*
Verb. s. 20. tom. i. p. 64.
τούτου ἕνεκεν μετὰ τὰς περὶ τῆς
θεότητος αὐτοῦ ἐκ τῶν ἔργων ἀπο-
δείξεις, ἥδη λοιπὸν καὶ ὑπὲρ πάντων

τὴν θυσίαν ἀνέφερεν, ἀντὶ πάντων
τὸν ἑαυτοῦ ναὸν εἰς θάνατον παραδι-
δούς.—

ⁿ Idem, *ibid* s. 37. p. 79.
καὶ τῷ τούτου θανάτῳ ἡ σωτηρία πᾶσι
γέγονε, καὶ ἡ κτίσις πᾶσα λελύτρωται·
οὗτός ἐστιν ἡ πάντων ζωὴ καὶ ὁ ὡς
πρόβατον ὑπὲρ τῆς πάντων σωτηρίας
ἀντίψυχον τὸ ἑαυτοῦ σῶμα εἰς θάνα-
τον παραδούς.—

life ; and I have power to take it again ° ? But he endured these things, having come for the salvation of all men ʳ.”

“ The mystical Sun of Righteousness is risen upon all, is come for all, has suffered for all, and has risen again for all : he therefore suffered that he might take away the sin of the world ¹.”

ARTICLE XII.

Of Good Works.

“ ALBEIT that Good Works, which are the fruits of faith, “ and follow after Justification, cannot put away our sins, “ and endure the severity of God’s judgment ; yet are “ they pleasing and acceptable to God in Christ, and do “ spring out necessarily of a true and lively Faith ; inso- “ much that by them a lively Faith may be as evidently “ known as a tree discerned by the fruit.”

This Article was not amongst those of 1552 ; but was added in 1562, in opposition to the Antinomians, Solifidians, and Gospellers, who denied the necessity of good works.

Of the following extracts some will shew that

° John, x. 18.

ʳ CYRIL. HIEROS. *Catech.* 13.—Ἀλλ’ ὁ μὲν ταῦτα ἐπέμεινεν, ἐπὶ σωτηρίᾳ ἑλθὼν πάντων.

¹ AMBROSE, *Expos. in Ps.* cxviii. s. 57. Mysticus autem

Sol ille justitiæ omnibus ortus est, omnibus venit, omnibus passus est, et omnibus resurrexit ; ideo autem passus est, ut tolleret peccatum mundi.

good works are necessary, others that “they do spring necessarily out of a true and lively faith.”

Clement of Rome pursues the same order as in our Articles : he speaks first of faith, then of good works, as its necessary fruits. Under the preceding Article will be found a long extract on faith^a ; he continues in the next section as follows :

“ What, therefore, shall we do, brethren ? Shall we be slothful in well-doing, and lay aside charity ? God forbid that any such thing should be done by us. But let us hasten with all earnestness and readiness of mind, to perfect every good work ; for even the Creator, and Lord of all things, himself rejoices in his own works ; by his Almighty power he fixed the heavens, and by his incomprehensible wisdom he adorned them. He also divided the earth from the water, which encompassed it as a secure tower, upon the foundation of his own will. All the living creatures also that are upon it, by his appointment, he commanded to exist. So, likewise, the sea, and all the creatures that are in it, having first created them, he enclosed therein by his power. And above all, that which is most excellent, and greatest of all, man he formed with his holy and pure hands, the character of his own image. For so God says, ‘ Let us make man in our image, after our own likeness. So God created man, male and female created he them^b.’ And having thus finished all these things he commended all that he had made, and blessed them, and said, ‘ increase and multiply^c.’ We see

^a Ante, p. 170-1. ^b Gen. i. 26, 27. ^c Gen. i. 28.

how all righteous men have been adorned with good works; wherefore even the Lord himself, having adorned himself with works, rejoiced. Having, therefore, this example, let us, without delay, fulfil his will; with all our strength let us work the works of righteousness^d."

Having further insisted on good works in the following section, he proceeds :

"How blessed and wonderful, beloved, are the gifts of God! Life in immortality! Brightness in righteousness! Truth in full assurance! Faith in confidence! Temperance in holiness! and all these things has God subjected to our understanding. What, therefore, are those things which are prepared for them that wait for him? The Creator and Father of spirits, the most holy, he only knows the greatness and beauty of them. Let us, therefore, strive with all earnestness that we may be found in the number of those that wait for him, that so we may share the promised rewards. But how, beloved, shall this be? If our mind be fixed by faith towards God, if we seek those things that are well-pleasing and acceptable unto him; if we act conformably to his holy will, and follow the way of truth, casting off from us all unrighteousness and iniquity, covetousness, strifes, evil manners, deceit, whispering, detraction, all hatred of God, pride, and boasting, vain glory and ambition;

^d CLEM. Rom. Ep. 1^a. ad Corinth. s. 33. Τὸ οὖν ποιήσωμεν ἀδελφοί; ἀργήσωμεν ἀπὸ τῆς ἀγαθοποίας, καὶ ἐγκαταλείπωμεν τὴν ἀγάπην; μηδαμῶς τοῦτο εἶσαι ὁ δεσ-

πότης ἐφ' ἡμῖν γεγεννηθῆναι· ἀλλὰ σπεύσωμεν μετὰ ἐκτενείας καὶ προθυμίας, πᾶν ἔργον ἀγαθὸν ἐπιτελεῖν. — Ἰδῶμεν ὅτι τὸ ἐν ἔργοις ἀγαθοῖς πάντες ἐκοσμήθησαν οἱ δίκαιοι. —

for they that do these things are odious to God ; and not only they that do them, but also “ all such as approve of those that do them ^f.”

“ Of which nothing is hid from you, if ye have perfect faith and charity in Jesus Christ, which are the beginning and end of life. For the beginning is faith, the end charity ; and these two joined in one are of God ; but all other things which concern a holy life, are the consequences of these. No man professing a true faith sinneth, nor possessing charity hateth. ‘ The tree is made manifest by its fruit ^g.’ So they, who profess themselves to be Christians, will be seen by what they do. For it is not the work of an outward profession, but *shows itself* in the power of faith, if a man be found faithful unto the end ^h.”

Polycarp says to the Philippians ; “ I rejoiced greatly with you, in our Lord Jesus Christ, that the firm root of your faith, which was declared from ancient times, remaineth until now, and bringeth forth fruit in our Lord Jesus Christ ⁱ.”

^e Rom. i. 32.

^f CLEM. *ibid.* s. 35.—Πῶς δὲ ἔσται τοῦτο, ἀγαπητοί ; ἐὰν ἐστη-
ριγμένη ἢ διάνοια ἡμῶν πίστεως
πρὸς τὸν Θεόν, ἐὰν ἐκζητῶμεν τὰ
εὐάρεστα, καὶ εὐπρόσδεκτα αὐτῷ, ἐὰν
ἐπιτελήσωμεν τὰ ἀνέκοντα τῇ ἀμώμφ
βουλῇ αὐτοῦ, καὶ ἀκολουθήσωμεν
τῇ ὁδοῦ τῆς ἀληθείας, ἀπορρίψαντες
ἀφ’ ἐαυτῶν πᾶσαν ἀδικίαν καὶ ἀνο-
μίαν, πλεονεξίαν, κ. τ. λ.

^g Matt. xii. 33.

^h IGNAT. *Ep. ad Ephes.* s. 14.—Ἀρχὴ μὲν πίστις, τέλος δὲ ἀγάπη· τὰ δὲ δύο ἐν ἐνότητι γενόμενα, Θεοῦ ἐστίν· τὰ δὲ ἄλλα πάντα

εἰς καλοκαγαθίαν ἀκόλουθα ἐστίν.
Οὐδεὶς πίστιν ἐπαγγελλόμενος ἀμαρ-
τάνει, οὐδὲ ἀγάπην κεκτημένος, μισεῖ.
Φανερόν τὸ δένδρον ἀπὸ τοῦ καρποῦ
αὐτοῦ, οὕτως οἱ ἐπαγγελλόμενοι
Χριστιανοὶ εἶναι, δι’ ὧν πράσσουσιν
ὁφθήσονται. Οὐ γὰρ νῦν ἐπαγγελίας
τὸ ἔργον, ἀλλ’ ἐν δυνάμει πίστεως,
ἐὰν τις εὐρεθῇ εἰς τέλος.

ⁱ POLYCARP. *ad Philipp.* s. 1.
—ὅτι ἡ βεβαία τῆς πίστεως ὑμῶν
ρίζα ἐξ ἀρχαίων καταγελλομένη
χρόνων, μέχρι νῦν διαμένει, καὶ καρ-
ποφορεῖ εἰς τὸν Κύριον ἡμῶν Ἰησοῦν
Χριστόν.

“Whosoever are found not to live as Christ taught, be it known that they are not Christians, though they profess with their tongue the doctrines of Christ. For he hath declared, that not they who only profess his religion, but they who do the works which he hath commanded them, shall be saved ^k.”

“He understandeth all these things, who inquireth into the wisdom of God, studying to please him by faith, righteousness, and good works ^l.”

“This faith, they that have believed without learning, as to our language they are barbarous, but as to their judgment, custom, and conversation, by reason of their faith, they are very wise, and please God, having their conversation in righteousness, chastity, and wisdom ^m.”

“Charity, with love to faith, makes believers; but faith is the foundation of charity, bringing forth well-doing ⁿ.”

“Faith, although it be a voluntary consent of the soul, is, however, the worker of good things, and the foundation of a right conduct ^o.”

“When we hear it said, ‘Thy faith hath saved

^k JUSTIN. *Apol.* 1^a. s. 16. Οἱ δ’ ἂν μὴ εὐρίσκωνται βιοῦντες ὡς ἐδίδαξε, γνωριζέσθωσαν μὴ ὄντες Χριστιανοί, κἂν λέγωνιν διὰ γλώττης τὰ τοῦ Χριστοῦ διδάγματα.—

^l THEOPHIL. *ad Autolyc.* 1. ii. c. ult. Ταῦτα δὲ πάντα συνήσει πᾶς ὁ ζητῶν τὴν σοφίαν τοῦ Θεοῦ, καὶ ἐναρεστῶν αὐτῷ διὰ πίστει, καὶ δικαιοσύνης, καὶ ἀγαθοεργίας.

^m IRENÆI *adv. Hæres.* 1. iii. c. iv. s. 2.—placent Deo,

conversantes in omni justitiâ, castitate et sapientiâ

ⁿ CLEM. ALEX. *Strom.* 1. ii. c. 6. p. 445. Ἡ μὲν ἀγάπη τῇ πρὸς τὴν πίστιν φίλια τοὺς πιστοὺς ποιεῖ· ἡ δὲ πίστις ἔδρασμα ἀγάπης ἀντεπάγουσα τὴν εὐποιαν.

^o Idem, *ibid.* 1. v. c. 13. p. 697. Ἡδὴ δὲ ἡ πίστις, εἰ καὶ ἐκούσιος τῆς ψυχῆς συγκατάθεσις, ἀλλὰ ἐργάτις ἀγαθῶν, καὶ δικαιοπραγίας θεμέλιος.

thee^p,' we do not understand him to say that they will be absolutely saved who believe in any way whatsoever, unless good works also shall follow^q."

It will be seen that Tertullian in the following passage is arguing against those who thought they could be saved by faith without works, as the fruits of faith; but the main scope of his argument is to show that certain sins are unpardonable:

"It has been said, 'the blood of his Son cleanseth us from all sin^r.' We may, therefore, always sin, and in all manner of ways, if he cleanses us always, and from all sin; or if he does not always cleanse us, he does not even after faith; and if not from all sin, not then from fornication. But with what did he (St. John) begin? He had said before that God is light, and that darkness is not in him, and that we lie if we say that we have fellowship with him, and walk in darkness. 'But if,' he says, 'we walk in the light, we have fellowship with him, and the blood of Jesus Christ our Lord cleanseth us from all sin.' Therefore, when we walk in the light and sin, and sinning in the light, are we cleansed? By no means; for he who sins is not in the light, but in darkness. Whence, also, he shews how we shall be cleansed from sin, while we walk in the light, in which sin cannot be committed. Therefore he says we are so cleansed, not that we may sin, but because we may not sin. For when

^p Luke, vii. 50. et alibi.

^q CLEM. *ibid.* l. vi. c. 14.
p. 794. "Ὡστε ὅταν ἀκούσωμεν.
Ἡ πίστις σου σέσωκέν σε, οὐχ ἀπλῶς

τοὺς ὁποσὺν πιστεύσαντας σωθή-
σεσθαι λέγειν αὐτὸν ἐκδεχόμεθα ἐὰν
μὴ καὶ τὰ ἔργα ἐπακολουθήσῃ.

^r 1 John, i. 7.

we walk in the light, but have no fellowship with darkness, we shall be cleansed, sin not being laid aside, but not admitted. For this is the power of the Lord's blood, that those whom it hath now cleansed from sin, and hath thenceforth placed in the light, it thenceforth makes clean, if they persevere walking in the light^s."

Tertullian then proceeds to argue that there are some sins which cannot be pardoned after baptism.

"And this faith, when it is justified, sticks in the ground of the soul, as a root that hath received the shower into it, that when it begins to be tilled by the law of God, the branches may rise from it that bear the fruit of good works. The root of righteousness, therefore, doth not grow from works, but the fruit of works from the root of righteousness, to wit, that root of righteousness, whereby God accepts of righteousness without works, viz., faith^t."

The following remarks on St. John's Gospel, viii. 24, are expressly to our present purpose:

" 'I said therefore unto you, that ye shall die in your sins: for if ye believe not that I am he, ye shall die in your sins.'^r When did he say unto them 'Ye shall die in your sins,' except when he

^s TERTULL. *de Pudicit.* c. 19.—Incedentes enim in lumine, tenebris vero non communicantes emundati agemus, non deposito, sed non admissio delicto. Hæc est enim vis Dominici sanguinis, ut quos jam delicto mundarit, et exinde in lumine constituerit, mundos ex-

inde præstet, si in lumine incedere perseveraverint.

^t ORIGEN. *in Ep. ad Rom.* l. iv. c. 1. —Non ergo ex operibus radix justitiæ, sed ex radice justitiæ fructus operum crescit, illâ scilicet radice justitiæ, quâ Deus acceptâ fert justitiam sine operibus.

said, 'Ye shall seek me, and shall die in your sins'.^u And what is the cause that men die in their sins, except that they do not believe, that Jesus is the Christ? For he himself says, 'If ye believe not that I am he, ye shall die in your sins.' But if he that believeth not, that Jesus is the Christ, shall die in his own sins, it is plain that he who dieth not in his sins hath believed in Christ; but he who dieth in his sins, although he says that he believeth in Christ, of a truth hath not believed in him. For if that may be called faith which is without works, such is a dead faith, as we read in the general Epistle of James ^x.

"But our works must be lift up into the holy things of God, that is, in clothing the naked, in feeding the hungry, in giving drink to the thirsty, in comforting the afflicted, in helping the oppressed, in loving all. For these things sanctify us in the frailty of our body; these things please God and are holy ^y."

"The worship of God consists of these two parts, pious doctrine and good works. Neither are doctrines without good works acceptable to God, nor does he accept works unless they be united with

^u John, viii. 21.

^x ORIGEN. *Com. in Evang. Joan.* tom. xix. s. 6. — Εἰ δὲ ὁ μὴ πιστεύων, ὅτι Ἰησοῦς ὁ Χριστός ἐστιν, ἀποθανεῖται ἐν ταῖς ἁμαρτίαις αὐτοῦ, δηλον ὅτι ὁ μὴ ἀποθνήσκων ἐν ταῖς ἁμαρτίαις αὐτοῦ πεπίστευκε τῷ Χριστῷ, ὁ δὲ ἀποθνήσκων ἐν ταῖς ἁμαρτίαις αὐτοῦ κἂν λέγῃ πιστεύειν τῷ Χριστῷ, ὡς πρὸς τὸ ἀληθές οὐ πε-

πίστευκεν αὐτῷ· ἐὰν γὰρ λέγεται μὲν πίστις, χωρὶς δὲ ἔργων τυγχάνῃ, νεκρά ἐστίν ἡ τοιαύτη, ὡς ἐν τῇ φερομένη Ἰακώβου ἐπιστολῇ ἀνέγνωμεν. .

^y HILAR. *Enar. in Ps.* cxxxiii. s. 5. — Hæc enim nos in hac corporis nostri infirmitate sanctificant, hæc Deo placent et sancta sunt.

pious doctrines. For what advantage is there in rightly knowing the doctrines concerning God, if you be shamefully guilty of fornication? Again, what good is there in being properly chaste and impiously blasphemous? The knowledge of doctrines is therefore an acquisition of the greatest importance, and there is need of a sober and watchful mind, since many spoil others through philosophy and vain deceit ^z.”

“As works are not accepted without faith, as many do what is right for the sake of glory, or from natural disposition, so faith without works is dead. And let no one deceive you by the vain reasoning of those, who readily grant every thing for the single purpose of adopting impious doctrines, and propose a trifling reward for a trifling thing. Shew therefore faith by works, the produce of your soul, if we have not sown in vain ^a.”

And again, “Upon this foundation of doctrines build good works, since faith without works is dead; as are works without faith ^b.”

“Knowest thou not, that they who are in their sins, although they live, are dead? but those who are in righteousness, although they die, yet do they live. Nor is this my saying, it is the declaration of

^z CYRIL. HIEROS. *Catech.* 4. Ὁ γὰρ τῆς θεοσεβείας τρόπος, ἐκ δύο τούτων συνέστηκε, δογμάτων εὐσεβῶν ἀκριβείας, καὶ πράξεων ἀγαθῶν· καὶ οὔτε τὰ δόγματα χωρὶς ἔργων ἀγαθῶν, εὐπρόσδεκτα θεῷ, οὔτε τὰ μὴ μετ’ εὐσεβῶν δογμάτων ἔργα τελούμενα, προσδέχεται ὁ θεός.—

^a GREG. NAZ. *Orat.* xxi.

Ὡς γὰρ οὐκ ἔστι χωρὶς πίστεως πράξις ἡγκρίτος—δείξατε οὖν ἐκ τῶν ἔργων τὴν πίστιν, τῆς χώρας ὑμῶν τὸ γόνιμον, εἰ μὴ εἰς κενὸν ἐσπείραμεν.

^b Idem, *Orat.* xli. Δεκτὸν ἐργάζου τὸ ἀγαθόν, ἐπὶ τούτῳ τῷ θεμελίῳ τῶν δογμάτων· ἐπεὶ πίστις χωρὶς ἔργων νεκρά, ὡς ἔργα δίχα πίστεως.

Christ who said to Martha, ‘he that believeth in me, though he were dead, yet shall he live^c.’ Is what I say then a fable? If thou art a Christian believe in Christ: if thou believest in Christ, shew me thy faith by thy works^d.”

“It is not sufficient to have the wall of faith, unless faith itself be confirmed by good works^e.”

ARTICLE XIII.

Of Works before Justification.

“WORKS done before the grace of Christ, and the Inspiration of his Spirit, are not pleasant to God, forasmuch as they spring not of faith in Jesus Christ, neither do they make men meet to receive grace, or (as the School-authors say) deserve grace of congruity; yea, rather for that they are not done as God hath willed, and commanded them to be done, we doubt not but they have the nature of sin.”

The tenets of Pelagius, who denied the necessity of divine grace, are here again condemned; though this Article should probably be considered as di-

^c John, xi. 25.

^d CHRYSOST. *ad Pop. Antioch.* Hom. v. — Εἰ Χριστιανὸς εἶ, πίστευε τῷ Χριστῷ· εἰ πιστεύεις τῷ Χριστῷ, διὰ τῶν ἔργων ἐπίδειξόν μοι τὴν πίστιν.

^e HIERON. *in Isai.* c. xxvi. tom. iii. p. 216. Non enim sufficit murum habere fidei, nisi ipsa fides bonis operibus confirmetur.

rected chiefly against the Church of Rome. In the Rhemish Testament, on Acts x. 2, is the following remark: "such works as are done before justification, though they suffice not to salvation, yet be acceptable preparatives to the grace of justification:" and afterwards "such works preparative come of grace also; otherwise they could never deserve at God's hand, of congruity, or any otherwise, towards justification."

Many of the passages given under the tenth and eleventh Articles would equally serve to illustrate this; and as several Articles will exceed the proposed limits, a few additional extracts must suffice ^a.

"They who are carnal, cannot do the things which are spiritual; neither can unbelief do the works of faith ^b."

"As the wild olive, if it be not grafted, continues useless to the owner, by reason of its wild quality, and as unfruitful wood is cut down, and cast into the fire; so man, who receives not by faith the grafting of the Spirit, continues to be what he was before; and being flesh and blood, he cannot inherit the kingdom of God ^c."

^a The reader may be referred to passages from the following authors given under the tenth and eleventh Articles. CLEM. ROM. ante, p. 157. JUSTIN, 159. IRENÆUS, 159. TERTULL. 161. ORIGEN, 162, 3, 4, and 173. HILARY, 164. CYRIL HIROS. 188. GREG. NAZ. 188. AMBROSE, 165. CHRYSOST. 166. JEROME, 169.

^b IGNATIUS *Ep. ad Ephes. c.*

8. Οἱ σαρκικοὶ τὰ πνευματικὰ πράσσειν οὐ δύνανται, οὐδὲ οἱ πνευματικοὶ τὰ σαρκικά, οὐδὲ ἡ ἀπιστία τὰ τῆς πίστεως.

^c IRENÆI *adv. Hæres. l. v. c. x. s. 2.* —sic et homo non assumens per fidem Spiritus insertionem, perseverat hoc esse quod erat ante; caro et sanguis existens, regnum Dei hæreditate possidere non potest.

Cyprian in the following passage calls baptism the death of crime, and life of virtue, and evidently declares that by our natural powers we can do no good thing : “ You surely know, and acknowledge as well as myself, what that death of crime, that life of virtue has either taken away from, or conferred upon, us ; you know it, nor do I declare it. To speak in one’s own praise is hateful boasting ; however that cannot be boasting, but an expression of gratitude, whatsoever is not ascribed to the virtue of man, but is declared to be of the gift of God : as now not to sin has begun to be the fruits of faith, so the sins that were committed before, were the consequences of human error. Of God, I say, of God comes all the power that we have ; thence we live ; thence we have strength ; thence deriving and conceiving vigour, we have hitherto reached this point, and thereby foresee the signs of the future ^d.”

Basil propounds the question, whether it be possible, and a thing pleasing and acceptable unto God, for one that is the servant of sin to perform righteousness, according to the rule of the saints’ piety ; and he determines it from several places of Scripture, that it is not, concluding thus, “ It is clear that it is altogether impossible and displeasing unto God, and dangerous to him that dares to do it. Wherefore I exhort, as the Lord teacheth,

^d CYPRIANI. *Ep.* ii. s. 2. ad *Donatum*.—ut jam non peccare, cœperit esse fidei ; quod ante peccatum est, fuerit erroris humani. Dei est, inquam,

Dei omne quod possumus ; inde vivimus ; inde pollemus ; inde sumpto et concepto vigore, hîc adhuc positi, futurorum indicia prænoscimus.

‘Let us first make the tree good, and then the fruit will be good!’ And let us first make clean the inside of the cup or platter, and then the outside will be wholly clean. And being taught by the Apostle, ‘Let us purify ourselves from all pollutions both of flesh and spirit, and then we shall perfect holiness in the love of Christ, that we may be well pleasing to God, and acceptable to the Lord unto the kingdom of heaven^e.’”

“Clearly shewing,” says Bishop Beveridge, from whom the above passage is taken, “that until we first be good, we can never do good.”

“Let us pronounce our sentence against those that do not believe in Christ, and yet think themselves valiant, and wise, and temperate, and just; that they may know that there is none can live without Christ, without whom all virtue lies in vice^f.”

“All the life of unbelievers is sin, and there is nothing good without the chiefest good: for where the knowledge of the eternal and unchangeable truth is wanting, there is but false virtue even in the best manners^g.” And again:

^e BASIL. *de Baptismo*. lib. ii. q. 7. Ἐν δυνατόν ἐστιν ἡ εὐάρεστον, ἢ εὐπρόσδεκτον Θεῷ, τὸν ἁμαρτίᾳ δουλεύοντα ποιεῖν δικαίωμα κατὰ τὸν τῆς θεοσεβείας τῶν ἁγίων κανόνα.—Τὸ παντάπασιν ἀδύνατον, καὶ ἀπαρέσκον Θεῷ, καὶ ἐπικίνδυνον τῷ τολμοῦντι δεδήλωται διόπερ παρακαλῶ, κ. τ. λ.

^f HIERON. *in Gal.* c. 3. Sententiam proferamus adversus eos qui in Christum non credentes, fortes, et sapientes,

et temperantes, se putant esse, et justos; ut sciant nullum absque Christo vivere, sine quo omnis virtus in vitio est.

^g AUGUSTIN. *de Vera Innocent.* c. 106. Omnis infidelium vita peccatum est, et nihil est bonum sine summo bono; ubi enim deest agnitio æternæ et incommutabilis veritatis, falsa virtus est etiam in optimis moribus.

“The man is first to be changed, that his works may be changed : for if a man remain in that estate that he is evil, he cannot have good works ^h.”

“Be it far from us to think that true virtue should be in any one unless he be a just man. And let it be as far from us to think that any one is truly just, unless he live by faith ; ‘for the just shall live by faith.’ And who of those who would be accounted Christians, unless it be the Pelagians, and amongst them perhaps thyself, Julian, only, will say that any infidel is just, will say that a wicked man is just, will say that a man enslaved to the devil is just ? Yea, though he were Fabricius, though he were Fabius, though he were Scipio, though he were Regulus, with whose names thou thinkest to terrify me, as if we were talking in the old Roman court ⁱ.”

Augustine has also a chapter in his work entitled *The City of God*, in which he undertakes to prove, “that there cannot be true virtuous actions, where there is not true religion.”

“For although the mind may seem to rule over the body, and reason over the passions ; if the mind and reason itself does not serve God, as God

^h AUGUSTIN. *de Verbis Evang. Matt. Serm. lxxii. (al. de Verb. Dom. xii.)* s. l. Prius est mutandus homo, ut opera mutantur ; si enim manet homo in eo quod malus est, bona opera habere non potest.

ⁱ Idem, c. *Julian. Pelag. lib. iv. c. 3.* Sed absit ut sit in aliquo vera virtus, nisi fuerit justus : absit autem ut sit

justus verè nisi vivat ex fide, ‘justus enim ex fide vivit,’ etc. The word “just” in the translation causes some confusion ; it might in most places be more properly translated “righteous ;” but the word “just” has been adopted in accordance with our Bible translation of the words here quoted from Habakkuk, ii. 4.

himself has commanded that he should be served, it by no means rightly rules over the body and the passions. For how can the mind be mistress over the body and the passions, if it be ignorant of the true God, and be not subdued to his obedience, but prostituted to the corruption of the most sinful dæmons. The virtues therefore, which it seems to have of its own, whereby it rules over the body and the passions, so as to acquire or retain any thing, if it does not refer them to God, are indeed themselves rather vices than virtues. For although some think that they are true and real virtues, when they are referred to themselves alone, and are not affected for any other account; yet even then are they puffed up and proud; and therefore are not to be accounted virtues, but vices^k."

^k Idem, *de Civitate Dei*. l. xix. c. 25. *Quod non possint ibi veræ esse virtutes, ubi non est vera religio.*—Proinde virtutes, quas sibi habere videtur, per quas imperat corpori et vitiis ad quodlibet adipiscendum vel tenendum, nisi ad Deum retulerit, etiam ipsæ vitia sunt

potius quàm virtutes. Nam licet à quibusdam, tunc veræ et honestæ putentur esse virtutes, cum ad se ipsas referuntur, nec propter aliud expetuntur; etiam tunc inflatæ ac superbæ sunt; et ideo non virtutes, sed vitia judicanda sunt.

ARTICLE XIV.

Of Works of Supererogation.

‘VOLUNTARY Works, besides, over and above God’s
“commandments, which they call Works of Supereroga-
“tion, cannot be taught without arrogance and impiety ;
“for by them men do declare that they do not only
“render unto God as much as they are bound to do, but
“that they do more for his sake, than of bounden duty is
“required ; whereas Christ saith plainly, When ye have
“done all that are commanded you, say, We are unprofit-
“able servants.”

It was not until the twelfth century that the doctrine of works of Supererogation was thought of in the Christian Church. From that time to the present it has been received by the Romish Church, and has proved a most prolific parent of Indulgences. Hence have arisen their doctrines of Pardon, and Invocation of Saints.

In the Rhemish Testament, on 2. Cor. viii. 14. the doctrine of Works of Supererogation is openly avowed, “Holy Saints, or other virtuous persons, may in measure and proportion of other men’s necessities and deservings, allot unto them, as well the supererogation of their spiritual works, as those that abound in worldly goods, may give alms of their superfluities, to them which are in necessity.”

Dr. Hey has well remarked, that “the proofs of

the eleventh, twelfth, and fifteenth Articles are proofs of this Article."

But inasmuch as the doctrine of works of supererogation was at the same time so prominent, and productive of such pernicious consequences in the Romish Church, it was highly necessary that it should meet with a direct denial in our Articles, and its rejection not be left to mere implication.

With a view to *proof* however little need be added to what will be found under the Articles referred to: a few of the strongest passages will suffice.

St. Polycarp in his Epistle to the Philippians, after having urged them to the practise of virtue, proceeds, "Abstaining from all wrath, respect of persons, and unrighteous judgment, being far from all covetousness, not easily believing any thing against any, nor over severe in judgment, knowing that we are all debtors in point of Sin ^a."

Clemens Alexandrinus remarks on these words 'If thou wilt be perfect ^b,' "He was not therefore yet perfect, for nothing is more than perfect ^c."

I shall have occasion to quote a very strong passage from Tertullian, under the twenty-second Article, on the Romish doctrine of Pardons, which is closely connected with this of works of Supererogation. In the section which will be found in that place he indignantly denies to the Bishop of Rome the power of granting pardons, and in this,

^a POLYCARP. *ad Philip.* s. 6.
—εἰδότες, ὅτι πάντες ὀφειλέται
ἐσμὲν ἁμαρτίας.

^b Matt. xix. 21.

^c CLEM. ALEX. *Quis Dives*

salvetur. c. 10. Εἰ θέλεις τέ-
λειος γενέσθαι· οὐκ ἄρα πῶ τέ-
λειος ἦν. οὐδὲν γὰρ τελείου τε-
λείωτερον.

which is the next following section, he proceeds to give his reasons in a strain of most bitter irony ; “Sufficient be it for a martyr to have wiped away his own sins.—Who looses another’s death by his own, except the Son of God alone ? For he freed the malefactor in his very suffering. For for this purpose he came, that being himself free from sin, and holy in all things, he might be obedient for sinners. Thou, therefore, who dost emulate him in pardoning sins, if thou hast thyself sinned in nothing, by all means suffer for me. But if thou art a sinner, how can the oil of thy torch be sufficient both for thee and me ^d.” In another place he says, “Every one has a right belonging to man, and a natural power to worship that which he shall think right ; nor is any one injured or profited by the religion of another ^e.”

“We ought not to glory in any thing, since nothing is our own. For, as we have it in St. John’s Gospel, ‘A man can receive nothing, except it be given him from heaven^f.’” John iii. 27.

“For no man is able to persuade the devil to let one out of his power, whom he hath once gotten

^d TERTULL. *de Pudicit.* c. 22. Sufficiat martyri propria delictopurgasse.—Quis alienam mortem suâ solvit, nisi solus Dei filius ? Nam et in ipsâ passione liberavit latronem. Ad hoc enim venerat, ut ipse a delicto purus et omnia sanctus pro peccatoribus obediret. Proinde qui illum æmularis donando delicta, planè patere pro nos. Si vero peccator es,

quomodo oleum faculæ tuæ sufficere et tibi et mihi poterit ?

^e TERTULL. *ad Scap.* c. 2. Humani juris et naturalis potestatis est unicuique, quod putaverit, colere ; nec alii obest, aut prodest, alterius religio.

^f CYPRIANI *Testim.* l. iii. c. 4. In nullo gloriandum quando nostrum nihil sit, in evangelio κατὰ Joannem. Nemo potest, etc.

into it. And he that cannot make satisfaction or propitiate God for his own sins, how can he do it for another ? ?”

ARTICLE XV.

Of Christ alone without Sin.

“CHRIST, in the truth of our nature, was made like unto us
“in all things (sin only except) from which he was clearly
“void, both in his flesh and in his spirit. He came to
“be the Lamb without spot, who by sacrifice of himself
“once made, should take away the sins of the world ;
“and sin, as Saint John saith, was not in him. But all
“we the rest, although baptized, and born again in
“Christ, yet offend in many things ; and if we say we
“have no sin, we deceive ourselves, and the truth is not
“in us.”

Two things are here asserted, first, Christ’s freedom from sin in his human nature ; secondly, the sinfulness of regenerate Christians.

The Socinians consider Christ to have been a mere man, and consequently to have been liable to commit sin.

The Pelagians maintained that a man may be without sin ; and the Antinomians held, that

§ BASIL. in Ps. xlviii. s. 3.
—ὅς γε οὐδὲ περὶ τῶν ἰδίων ἀμαρ-
τημάτων, οἷος τέ ἐστι, ἐξίλασμα

δοῦναι τῷ Θεῷ, πῶς οὖν ἰσχύσει
τοῦτο ὑπὲρ ἑτέρου πράξαι ;

Christ having fulfilled the law for them, had taken away sin. The latter part of this Article may therefore be considered as directed against these tenets: and also as an addition to the preceding denial of Works of Supererogation taught by the Church of Rome; for having declared that Works of Supererogation cannot be taught without arrogancy and impiety, we now declare that all, although baptized and born again in Christ, yet offend in many things.

“If any man say, that the flesh of our Lord differed from ours in this respect, because it committed no sin, neither was guile found in his soul, but that we are sinners, he speaketh rightly ^a.”

“Our Instructor is like unto God his Father, whose Son he is, without sin, blameless, and without passion in his soul ^b.” Again; “But he (Christ,) was altogether free from human passions, and therefore is he alone judge, because he alone is without sin; but we, by what strength we have, strive to avoid the least sins ^c.”

“The Word alone is without sin, for to sin is natural and common to all ^d.”

Tertullian says, “For God alone is without sin,

^a IRENÆI *adv. Hæres.* lib. v. c. xiv. s. 3. Si quis igitur secundum hoc alteram dicit Domini carnem à nostrâ carne, quoniam illa quidem non peccavit, neque inventus est dolus in animâ ejus, nos autem peccatores, rectè dicit.

^b CLEM. ALEX. *Pædag.* lib. i. c. 2. Ἐοῖκεν ὁ Παιδαγωγὸς ἡμῶν τῷ Πατρὶ αὐτοῦ τῷ Θεῷ,

οὐ πέρ ἐστιν εἰδὸς ἀναμάρτητος, ἀνεπίληπτος, καὶ ἀπαθὴς τὴν ψυχὴν.

^c Idem, *ibid.*—διὰ τοῦτο γὰρ καὶ μόνος κριτὴς, ὅτι ἀναμάρτητος μόνος· ἡμεῖς δὲ ὅση δύναμις, ὡς ὅτι ἐλάχιστα ἀμαρτάνειν πειρώμεθα.

^d Idem, *ibid.* lib. iii. c. ult. Μόνος γὰρ ἀναμάρτητος ὁ Λόγος. τὸ μὲν γὰρ ἐξαμαρτάνειν πάσιν ἔμφυτον καὶ κοινόν.

and the only man without sin is Christ, because Christ is also God ^e."

And in another place he speaks of the sinfulness of man :

"There are some sins which every day we are all liable to run into. For to whom doth it not happen to be 'angry without cause,' and to 'let the sun go down upon his wrath,' or to strike his neighbour, or freely to rail against him, or to swear rashly, or to break the promises he made in covenants or bargains, or to tell a lie through bashfulness or necessity ^f."

Hippolytus, arguing that the divine nature in Christ was not altered or diminished by the assumption of the human nature, says ; "Wherefore also the Word of God, being truly made man as we are, yet without sin, and having acted and suffered humanly whatsoever things are incident to our nature, without being sinful, and having for our sakes endured to be circumscribed in natural flesh, did not undergo any change, nor did that which is the same with the Father become in any respect the same with the flesh by means of divesture ^g."

And in another place ; "For he, who is always by nature God, by his superinfinite power, becoming, as he wished, man without sin, continues to be

^e TERTULL. *de Anim.* c. 41. —et solus homo sine peccato Christus, quia et Deus Christus.

^f TERTULL. *de Pudicit.* c. 19. Quòd sint quædam delicta quotidianæ incursionis, quibus

omnes simus objecti. Cui enim non accidit, aut irasci inique etc ?

^g HIPPOLYTI c. *Ber. et Hel.* v. i. c. 1. Διὸ καὶ καθ' ἡμᾶς ἀληθῶς γεγόμενος ἄνθρωπος χωρὶς ἁμαρτίας ὁ τοῦ Θεοῦ Λόγος, κ. τ. λ.

what he was, with every thing that we conceive of God, and he also continues to be what he was made, with all we can conceive and naturally understand of man^h.”

“The Saviour himself was the ark made of incorruptible wood; for his incorruptible and imperishable tabernacle was thus signified, which produced no corruption of sin; for the sinner makes confession and says, ‘My wounds stink and are corrupt because of my foolishnessⁱ.’ But the Lord was without sin, of incorruptible wood in his human nature, that is, of the Virgin and the Holy Ghost within, and without, the Word of God, as it were covered with the purest gold^k.^l”

Origen quotes an objection of Celsus, “The body of God could not be such as your’s is;” and proceeds to answer it, “But we say to this, that he took upon himself a body, as from a woman, when he dwelt amongst us in this life, human, and subject to human death: therefore amongst other things we say that he was a great champion on account of men, his human body being tempted in all things as all are; but not as other men, with sin; but altogether without sin: for it appears very plain to us, that ‘he did no sin, nor was guile found in his mouth^m, and because he knew not sin, God gave him, as being pure, for all who have sinnedⁿ.’”

^h Idem, *ibid.* c. 4. — γε-
νόμενος, ὡς ἠθέλησεν, ἄνθρωπος ἀνα-
μάρτητος —

ⁱ Ps. xxxviii. 5.

^k Exodus, xxxvii. 1, 2.

^l HIPPOLYTI *Fragm. in Ps.*
xxiii. vol. i. p. 268. — ‘Ο δὲ

Κύριος ἀναμάρτητος ἦν ἐκ τῶν ἀσῆπ-
των ξύλων τὸ κατὰ ἄνθρωπον, του-
τέστιν ἐκ τῆς παρθένου καὶ τοῦ Ἁγίου
Πνεύματος, κ. τ. λ.

^m Isaiah, liii. 9. 1 Peter, ii.
22. 2 Cor. v. 21.

ⁿ ORIGEN, c. *Cels.* lib. i. s.

“All his acts, from his very first coming, are marked by accompanying patience; that in the first place coming down from that heavenly height to earth, the Son of God does not despise putting on the flesh of man, and though he was not himself a sinner, to bear the sins of others^o.”

“Wherefore to have nothing of what our adversary possesseth is the privilege of the Lord alone, who was partaker with us of his passions, yet without sin^p.”

“Perhaps it is not without cause, that when we often find in Scripture that men are said to be without complaint, we can find none said to be without sin, but that one alone of whom it is openly said, ‘him who did not know sin’^q.”

And elsewhere he propounds this question, “Whether not only there is some one of the children of men, but whether there ever could have been any heretofore, or can any be hereafter, who never had or never will have any sin at all?” And he answers immediately, “It is most certain there is none, never was, nor ever will be any such at all, besides the one Mediator betwixt God and man, the man Christ Jesus^r.”

69. — οὐκέτι δ', ὡς ἄνθρωποι μετὰ ἁμαρτίας, ἀλλὰ πάντα χωρὶς ἁμαρτίας—

^o CYPRIANI *de Bono Patientiæ*, c. 3.—et cū peccator ipse non esset, aliena peccata portare.

^p GREG. NYSS. in *Eccl.*— Διὸ τὸ μηδὲν ἐσχηκέναι τῶν τοῦ ἀντικειμένου κτημάτων, μόνου τοῦ

Κυρίου ἐστι, τοῦ μετασχόντος ἡμῶν τῶν αὐτοῦ παθημάτων χωρὶς ἁμαρτίας.

^q AUGUSTIN. *de Nat. et Grat.* c. xiv.—non invenitur qui sit dictus sine peccato, nisi unus solus de quo apertè dictum est, *eum qui non noverat peccatum.*

^r Idem. *de Peccatorum*

And again :

“ If therefore those things be true that we have spoken so largely concerning infants, there neither is amongst the children of men, nor was, nor will be, any without sin, except the one Mediator, in whom propitiation and justification is placed for us, whereby the enmities of our sins being destroyed, we are reconciled unto God^s. ”

“ Having read the works I sent lately to you, my dearest son, Marcellinus, concerning the baptism of infants, and the perfection of the righteousness of man, that none in this life ever did or ever will attain unto, except the one Mediator who suffered human passions in the likeness of sinful flesh, yet without any sin at all^t. ”

Meritis et Remiss. lib. ii. c. 20.—Hunc prorsus præter unum Mediatorem Dei et hominum, hominem Christum Jesum, nullum esse, vel fuisse, vel futurum esse, certissimum est.

^s Idem, *ibid.*—nec est in filiis hominum quisquam, nec fuit, nec erit (sine peccato) excepto uno Mediatore in quo nobis propitiatio et justificatio

posita est, per quam, finitis inimiciis peccatorum, reconciliamur Deo.

^t Idem. *de Spiritu et Literá ad Marcellinum*, c. 1.—Quòd eam nemo in hâc vitâ vel assecutus, vel assecuturus videatur, excepto uno Mediatore, qui humana perpessus est in similitudine carnis peccati, sine ullo omnino peccato, etc.

ARTICLE XVI.

Of Sin after Baptism.

“NOT every deadly sin, willingly committed after Baptism, is sin against the Holy Ghost, and unpardonable, wherefore the grant of repentance is not to be denied to such as fall into sin after Baptism. After we have received the Holy Ghost, we may depart from grace given and fall into sin; and by the grace of God we may rise again, and amend our lives; and therefore they are to be condemned, which say, they can no more sin as long as they live here, or deny the place of forgiveness to such as truly repent.”

The Montanists, Novatians, and Anabaptists denied the efficacy of repentance in certain cases. In our Homilies (on Repentance) the Novatians are expressly referred to, though the Anabaptists, at the period of the Reformation, seem in this Article to have been chiefly aimed at.

The Calvinists, on the other hand, contended that they who had once received the Holy Ghost, could not be guilty of sin, they considered perseverance to be the consequence of election, so that the faithful can never fall away.

These two points must here receive a separate consideration.

First then, “*the grant of repentance is not to be denied to such as fall into sin after baptism.*”

Ignatius having urged the Philadelphians to flee divisions and false doctrines, and to submit themselves to their spiritual rulers, proceeds, “For as many as are of God and Jesus Christ, are with their bishop. But as many as having repented shall return to the unity of the Church, they also shall be of God, that they may live according to Jesus Christ. Be not deceived, my brethren; if any one follows one that makes a schism, he does not inherit the kingdom of God. If any one walks after another opinion, he agrees not with the passion^a.”

Again, “Where there is division and wrath God dwelleth not; but the Lord forgives all that repent, if they repent to the unity of God, and to the council of the bishop^b.”

In the former of these two passages Ignatius says that a schismatic “does not inherit the kingdom of God;” this therefore may be considered as an instance of a “deadly sin, willingly committed after baptism;” and yet he invites such an one to repent and to return to the unity of the Church.

The passages in Cyprian’s works, that might be adduced in support of the position now before us, are so numerous, that the only difficulty is that of

^a IGNAT. *ad Philad.* s. 3.—
Εἴ τις σχίζοντι ἀκολουθεῖ, βασιλείαν
Θεοῦ οὐ κληρονομεῖ.

^b Idem, *ibid.* s. 8.—Πᾶσιν

ὅν μετανοῶσιν ἀφίει ὁ Κύριος,
ἐὰν μετανοήσωσιν εἰς ἐνότητα Θεοῦ,
καὶ συνέδριον τοῦ ἐπισκόπου.

selection. A considerable portion of his long letter to Antonianus respecting the dispute between Cornelius and Novatian, the latter of whom had been irregularly chosen and ordained to the see of Rome, is taken up in refuting the opinion of Novatian's followers, who maintained that the Church should not grant pardon to those Christians who had lapsed in time of persecution; he says, "We ought to mourn with those that mourn, and to weep with those that weep, and, as far as we are able, to raise them up again by the aid and consolation of our love, and neither, on the one hand, be over harsh and pertinacious in rejecting their repentance, nor, on the other hand, over ready and easy in hastily conceding the rights of communion. Behold, a brother lies wounded in battle by the adversary. On the one side the devil strives to kill whom he hath wounded; on the other Christ exhorts him, whom he hath redeemed, not to perish entirely. Which of the two shall we assist, on which side shall we place ourselves? shall we favour the devil that he may destroy, and, like the priest and Levites in the Gospel, shall we pass by our brother who lies half dead? or as priests of God, and Christ, imitating what Christ both taught and did, shall we snatch the wounded from the jaws of the adversary, that we may reserve him, being cured, for God his judge^c."

^c CYPRIAN. Ep. lii. s. 12. tum possumus auxilio et solatio
ad Antonian.—et eos quan- nostre dilectionis erigere, nec

Shortly afterwards in the same Epistle he says :

“ But I wonder that there are some so obstinate as not to think repentance ought to be given to such as are fallen, or suppose that pardon should be denied to penitents, when it is written, ‘ Remember from whence thou art fallen, and repent, and do the just works ^d.’ ^e”

And again, he quotes Ezekiel xviii. 20. and adds, “ Which reading, to wit, and holding, we think none ought to be driven away from the fruit of satisfaction and the hope of peace ; when we know, according to the faith of the divine Scriptures, God himself being the author and exhorter to it, sinners are compelled to ask repentance ; and pardon and indulgence are not denied to the penitents ^f.”

Again, “ But seeing we find none ought to be prohibited from acting repentance ; and that to such as deprecate and pray for the mercy of the Lord, according to that wherein he is merciful and holy, peace may be granted by his priests, the sighs of the sorrowful are to be admitted, and the fruit of repentance is not to be denied to such as grieve ^g.”

adeo immites et pertinaces ad eorum pœnitentiam retundendam, nec iterum soluti et faciles ad communicationem temerè laxandam.

^d Rev. ii, 5.

^e CYPRIANI Ep. lii. s. 14. *ad Antonian.*—Miror autem quosdam sic obstinatos esse, ut dandam non putent lapsis pœnitentiam, aut pœnitentibus

existiment veniam denegandam, etc.

^f Idem, *ibid.* s. 19.—neminem putamus à fructu satisfactionis et spe pacis arcendum, cum sciamus—veniam atque indulgentiam pœnitentibus non denegari.

^g Idem, *ibid.* s. 20.—Quod si invenimus à pœnitentiâ agendâ neminem debere prohiberi, et

“ In the choice of evils, it is rather to be chosen that a man having obtained baptism should be again in sin, than that he should end his life void of grace. For sin, indeed, may perhaps have pardon and mercy, whereof good people have great hope ; but salvation is altogether forbidden to the other by a certain and determinate sentence ^h. ”

Chrysostom's language is sufficiently strong on this point : he says that Judas, if he had lived, and persevered in his repentance, might have been saved. “ That he might have been saved, if he had lived, is plain from those that crucified our Saviour. For if he saved those that lifted him up on the cross, and, when he was on the cross itself, besought the Father, and asked for pardon for their so great wickedness, it is manifest that he would also have received the traitor with all kindness, if he had shewn his repentance in a becoming manner ; but he, being overwhelmed with excessive grief, was not able to persevere in the remedy ⁱ. ”

deprecantibus atque exorantibus Domini misericordiam, secundum quod ille misericors et pius est, per sacerdotes ejus pacem posse concedi, admitendus est plangentium gemitus, et pœnitentiæ fructus dolentibus non negandus.

^h GREG. NYSS. *Orat. adv. eos qui differunt Baptismum*. In electione malorum magis est eligendum, ut salutare lavacrum assecutus rursus sit in peccato, quam ut gratiæ ex-

pers vitam finiat. Nam peccatum quidem veniam fortasse consequetur aut clementiam, cujus magna est spes apud bonos ; alteri autem est omnino vetita salus ex certâ et definitâ sententiâ.

ⁱ CHRYSOST. *Hom. de Pœnitentiâ*, x. “ Οτι γάρ εἰ ἔζη, καὶ αὐτὸς ἐσώθη ἂν, δὴλον ἐκ τῶν σταυρωσάντων· εἰ γὰρ τοὺς ἐπὶ τὸν σταυρὸν αὐτὸν ἀναβιβάσαντας ἔσωσε, καὶ ἐν αὐτῷ τῷ σταυρῷ ὧν παρεκάλει τὸν Πατέρα, καὶ συγγνώμην αὐτοῖς

Chrysostom then refers to the parable of the prodigal son, and proceeds :

“ I have adduced this parable in order that you may learn, that there is remission of sins committed even after baptism, if we consider the matter. I mention this not that I may lead you to be indolent, but that I may draw you back from despair ; for despair works us more evils than indolence. This son, therefore, bears the image of those that fall after baptism ; that he does represent those that have fallen after baptism, is evident from this, that he is called a son ; for no one is called a son without baptism ; and moreover he dwelt in his father's house, and shared all his father's substance ; but before baptism it is not allowed us to take what is our father's, nor to receive our inheritance : so by means of all these things, the condition of those that believe is shadowed out ^k. ”

And in another place he says, “ As it is easy to be baptized by water, so is it easy for the soul to repent : the malefactor did not require a long

ἤτει τοῦ τολμήματος, εὐδηλον ὅτι καὶ τὸν προδόντα, εἰ νόμῳ τῷ προσήκοντι τὴν μετάνοιαν ἐπεδείξατο, μετὰ πάσης αὖ εὐμενείας ἐδίδεατο· ἀλλ' ἐκεῖνος οὐκ ἠνέσχετο ἐμμεῖναι τῷ φαρμάκῳ, τῇ περισσοτέρᾳ λύπῃ καταποθεῖς.

^k Idem, *ibid.* Ταύτην δὲ τὴν παραβολὴν προήχθη ἐίπεῖν, ἵνα μάθῃτε, ὅτι καὶ τῶν μετὰ τὸ βάπτισμα ἁμαρτημάτων ἐστὶν ἄφεσις, εἰ ἀν προσέχωμεν· λέγω δὲ οὐκ ἵνα εἰς ῥαθυμίαν ἐμβάλω, ἀλλ' ἵνα ἀπὸ ἀπογνώσεως ἀπαγάγω· καὶ γὰρ χεῖρονα

τῆς ῥαθυμίας ἡμᾶς ἢ ἀπόγνῳσις ἐργάζεται κακὰ· οὗτος τοίνυν ὁ υἱὸς, εἰκόνα τῶν μετὰ τὸ λουτρὸν φέροι πέσόντων· ὅτι δὲ τοὺς μετὰ τὸ βάπτισμα παραπεσόντας· δηλοῖ, δῆλον ἐκείθεν· υἱὸς γὰρ λέγεται· οὐδεὶς δὲ υἱὸς βαπτίσματος ἀν κληθεῖν χωρὶς· καὶ τὴν οἰκίαν δὲ ὥκει τὴν πατρῴαν, καὶ τὰ πατρῴα διενείματο πάντα· πρὸ δὲ βαπτίσματος οὐκ ἔστι πατρῴα λαβεῖν, οὐδὲ δεῖσθαι κληρονομίαν· ὥστε διὰ πάντων ἡμῶν τούτων, τὸ τῶν πιστῶν αἰνίττεται τάγμα.

time; the martyrs have been crowned in a moment; but if we have committed deadly sins, and which do not deserve pardon, since we have saving remedies let us not despair; for not to have fallen is difficult, but when one has fallen, not to rise again, is diabolical and damnable¹.”

“ But if any one think that then the word is spoken against the Holy Ghost, when it is spoken by him to whom his sins are already forgiven by baptism, let them consider that even from such, by the holiness of the church, the place of repentance is not taken away^m. ”

“ For if ignorance only obtained pardon, and ignorance is not accepted but only before a man be baptized, not only if he speak a word against the Holy Ghost after baptism, but also if he speak against the Son of Man, and moreover if he defile himself with fornication, homicide, or any other sin or fault after baptism, he cannot be cured by repentance. Which such as hold, are excluded from the catholic communion, and it is judged that they cannot be partakers of God’s mercy so long as they continue in that crueltyⁿ. ”

¹ CHRYSOST. *Hom. lxxvii. de Pœnitent. et Continent. et Virginitate.* “Ὅσπερ εὐκόλον ἐστι βαπτισθῆναι εἰς ὕδωρ, οὕτως εὐκόλον ἐστι τὸ μετανοῆσαι ψυχὴν· οὐκ ἔδε-
ήθη χρόνον ὁ ληστής· οἱ μάρτυρες ἐν ἀκερταίῳ ἐστεφανώθησαν· εἰ δὲ ἀσύγ-
γνωστα καὶ πρὸς θάνατον ἡμαρτή-
καμεν, ἔχοντες τὰ σωτήρια φάρμακα
μὴ ἀπογινώμεν· οὐ γὰρ τὸ πεσεῖν
ἐστι χαλεπὸν, ἀλλὰ τὸ πεσόντα μὴ
ἀναστῆναι, σατανικὸν καὶ ὀλέθριον.

^m AUGUST. *Exposit. Epist. ad Rom. inchoatæ*, s. 16. Quod si quisquam tunc putat verbum dici adversus Spiritum Sanctum, cum ab eo dicitur cui jam per baptismum dimissa sunt peccata, attendant nec talibus per Ecclesiæ sanctitatem auferri pœnitentiæ locum.

ⁿ Idem, *ibid.* Si enim sola ignorantia veniam meretur, et ignorantia non accipitur nisi

“ But the love of our neighbour, that is, the love of man, even unto the love of our enemy, the Lord himself commendeth to us; and we see how many that are baptized both acknowledge them to be true, and reverence them as the commands of the Lord. But when they undergo the enmities of any one, they are so inflamed with the desire of revenge, that they burn with such flames of hatred, that they cannot be appeased though the Gospel itself be read and recited to them; and the churches are full of such men already baptized; which, notwithstanding, spiritual men will not cease in a brotherly way to admonish, and, with the spirit of meekness they constantly instruct, that they would be ready to meet and resist such temptations, and that they would love rather to reign in the peace of Christ, than to rejoice in the oppression of an enemy; which would be done in vain, if there was no hope of pardon nor cure of repentance left for such sins.”

Secondly. “ After we have received the Holy Ghost, we may depart from grace given, and fall into sin; and by the grace of God we may rise again, and amend our lives.”

antequam quisquam fuerit baptizatus, non solum si adversus Spiritum Sanctum, sed etiam si adversus Filium hominis post baptismum dixerit verbum, et omnino si quâ fornicatione, vel homicidio, vel ullo flagitio aut facinore, post baptismum sese maculaverit, non potest pœnitendo curari: quod qui sense-

runt, exclusi sunt à communionem catholicâ, satisque iudicatum est eos in illâ crudelitate divinæ misericordiæ participes esse non posse.

° Idem, ibid.—Quod inaniter fieret si talium peccatorum nulla spes veniæ, nulla pœnitentiæ medicina remaneret.

This part of the Article is connected with the former question, though it opposes the errors of a different sect; the one denying the possibility of sinning in certain cases; the other admitting the possibility of sinning in the same cases, but denying any place of forgiveness, or possibility of repentance. All the foregoing extracts from the Fathers, therefore, which admit the grant of repentance, by implication admit also the possibility of sinning after grace given.

This second question is also closely connected with the doctrine of predestination and election, which will next come before us; but as it will be more convenient to keep but one point in view under the next Article, viz. the way in which the foreknowledge of God can be reconciled with free will in man, the question of irresistible grace may be now considered.

Bishop Tomline has, in his "Refutation of Calvinism," so fully collected the belief of the Fathers on this point, that I cannot do better than select from his work some from amongst those passages which more immediately bear on the present question; especially as no reasonable person, who has studied the Fathers, can doubt that he has represented their tenets fairly and truly.

The first part of the following passage from Clemens Romanus has been already given in proof of the doctrine of the Atonement^p.

"Let us look steadfastly at the blood of Christ,

^p Ante, p. 177.

and see how precious his blood is in the sight of God; which, being shed for our salvation, has obtained the grace of repentance for all the world. Let us search into all ages, and learn that our Lord has in every one of them given opportunity for repentance to all such as were willing to turn unto him ^a."

This passage, it is true, does not say that those who have received grace, can afterwards fall from grace given, but it certainly does oppose the *partial* doctrine of irresistible grace.

"God therefore has given good, and they who work it shall receive glory and honour, because they worked good, when then had in their power not to work it: but those who do not work it, will receive the just judgment of God, because they have not worked good when they had it in their power to work it. But if some men were bad by nature, and others good, neither the good would deserve praise, for they were created so, nor would the bad deserve blame, being born so. But since all men are of the same nature, and able to lay hold of and do that which is good, and able to reject it again, and not do it, some justly receive praise, even from men, who act according to good laws, and much more from God; and obtain deserved testimony of generally choosing and persevering in that which is good; but others are blamed, and receive the deserved reproach of rejecting that which is just and good. And therefore the Pro-

^a CLEM. *Rom. Ep.* 1^a. c. 7. ante p. 157. n. ^a.

phets exhorted men to do justice, and perform good works ^q.”

After quoting several passages of Scripture, Irenæus adds, “All these things shew the free will of man, and the counsel of God, exhorting against disobedience, but not forcing our wills. For if any one should be unwilling to follow the Gospel, it is permitted him, although it is not expedient. For disobedience to God and loss of good, are in the power of man, but they cause no small injury and mischief. And on this account St. Paul says, ‘All things are lawful but all things are not expedient’^r, referring both to the liberty of man; on which account all things are permitted, God not compelling man; and by the expression ‘not expedient,’ shewing that they should not abuse liberty for a cloak of maliciousness, for this is not expedient. And again he says, ‘Speak every man truth with his neighbour’^s; and ‘Let no corrupt communication proceed out of your mouth; neither filthiness, nor foolish talking, nor jesting, which are not convenient, but rather giving of thanks’^t.’ And, ‘For ye were sometimes darkness, but now are ye light in the Lord; walk as children of light; not in rioting and drunkenness; not in chambering and

^q IRENÆI *adv. Hæres.* l. iv. c. xxxvii. s. 1, and 2.—ἐπειδὴ οἱ πάντες τῆς αὐτῆς εἰσι φύσεως, δυνάμενοι τε κατασχεῖν καὶ πρᾶξαι τὸ ἀγαθόν, καὶ δυνάμενοι πάλιν ἀποβαλεῖν αὐτὸ, καὶ μὴ ποιῆσαι δικαίως καὶ παρ’ ἀνθρώποις τοῖς εὐνομούμενοις, καὶ πολὺ πρότερον

παρὰ Θεοῦ οἱ μὲν ἐπαινοῦνται, καὶ ἀξίας τυγχάνουσι μαρτυρίας, καὶ τοῦ καλοῦ καθόλου ἐκλογῆς καὶ ἐπιμονῆς· οἱ δὲ κατατιῶνται, καὶ ἀξίας τυγχάνουσι ζημίας κ. τ. λ.

^r 1 Cor. vi. 12.

^s Eph. iv. 25.

^t Eph. iv. 29, and v. 4.

wantonness; not in strife and envying; and such were some of you; but ye are washed, but ye are sanctified in the name of the Lord^u.’ If then it were not in our power to do or not to do these things, what reason had the Apostle, and much more our Lord himself, to exhort us to do some things and to abstain from others? But because man is of a free will from the beginning, and God of a free will, in whose likeness man was made, advice is always given him to keep the good, which is done by obedience to God. And God has preserved to man a will free, and in his own power, not only in works, but also in faith, saying, ‘According to your faith, be it unto you^x:’ shewing that the faith of man is his own, because he has his own will^y.”

And shortly afterwards; “If you shall not believe in him, the cause of imperfection will be in you, who did not obey, but not in him who called. For he sent to call to the marriage; but they who did not obey, deprived themselves of the royal supper. The power of God therefore is not wanting; for he is able of stones to raise up children to Abraham; but he who does not obtain it, is the cause of his own imperfection. Nor does the light fail because men blind themselves; but that remaining as it is, those who are blinded are in darkness from their own fault, the light not en-

^u Eph. v. 8, Rom. xiii. 13.
1. Cor. vi. 12.

^x Matt. ix. 29.

^y IRENÆI *adv. Hæres.* l. iv. c. xxxvii. s. 3. and 4. Ταῦτα

γὰρ πάντα τὸ αὐτεξούσιον ἐπι-
δείκνυσι τοῦ ἀνθρώπου, καὶ τὸ
συμβουλευτικὸν τοῦ Θεοῦ—ἀπο-
τρέποντος μὲν τοῦ ἀπειθεῖν αὐτῷ,
ἀλλὰ μὴ βιάζομένου.—

slaving any one by necessity ; nor God forcing, if any one should, not be willing to avail himself of his (God's) power. Those, therefore, who desert the light given by the Father, and transgress the law of liberty, have deserted it from their own fault, having been made free, and endowed with free will ^z."

"To whom will the Lord say, 'Your's is the kingdom of heaven ^a.' It is your's, if ye be willing, who have the power of choosing the things which belong to God : it is your's, if ye be willing only to believe, and to obey those brief instructions which have been preached to you ^b."

"Moreover, because the soul, having substance and life in itself, when it departs out of this world, will be disposed of according to its merits, either enjoying the inheritance of eternal life and bliss, if its conduct shall have procured this for it, or suffering eternal fire and punishment, if the guilt of its sins shall have thrust it into that condition ; and because there will be a time of the resurrection of the dead, when this body, 'which is sown in corruption, will be raised in incorruption ; and that which is sown in dishonour, will be raised in

^z Idem, l. iv. c. xxxix. s. 3. Si autem non credideris ei, et fugeris manus ejus, erit causa imperfectionis in te, qui non obedisti, sed non in illo qui vocavit.—μήτε τοῦ φωτός μετ' ἀνάγκης δουλαγωγούντός τινα, μήτε τοῦ Θεοῦ βιαζομένου, εἰ μὴ θέλοι τις κατασχεῖν αὐτοῦ τὴν τέχνην.

^a Matt. v. 3. and 10.

^b CLEM. ALEX. *Cohort. ad Gent.* c. 10. p. 79. Τῇ λαλήτει Κύριος, ἡμῶν ἐστὶν ἡ βασιλεία τῶν οὐρανῶν. ἡμῶν ἐστὶν, εἰ μὴ θέλησῃτε, τῶν πρὸς τὸν Θεὸν τὴν προαίρεσιν ἐσχηκότων ἡμῶν, εἰ μὴ θέλησῃτε πιστεῦσαι μόνον, καὶ τῇ συντομίᾳ τοῦ κηρύγματος ἔπεσθαι.

glory^c; this also is settled in the doctrine of the Church, that every rational soul has free will, and that it has to contend against the devil and his angels, and the powers which oppose it, because they strive to burden it with sins; but we, if we live rightly and prudently, endeavour to rescue ourselves from this burden. Whence, consequently, we may understand, that we are not subject to necessity, so as to be compelled by all means to do either bad or good things, although it be against our will. For if we be masters of our will, some powers, perhaps, may urge us to sin, and others assist us to safety: yet we are not compelled by necessity to act either rightly or wrongly^d.”

“But because the Apostle sometimes does not ascribe to God that the vessel is to honour or dishonour, but refers the whole to ourselves, saying, ‘If a man therefore purge himself from these, he shall be a vessel unto honour, sanctified and meet for the master’s use, and prepared unto every good work^e:’ and sometimes he does not attribute it to ourselves, but seems to refer every thing to God, saying, ‘Hath not the potter power over the clay, of the same lump to make one vessel unto honour, and another unto dishonour.’ These expressions are not contradictory: they are reconcilable, and one perfect sense may be derived from them; for

^c 1 Cor. xv. 42, 43.

^d ORIGEN *de Princip.* l. i. *Præf.* s. 5.—Est et illud definitum in ecclesiasticâ prædicatione, omnem animam rationabilem esse liberi arbitrii et

voluntatis. Unde et consequens est intelligere, non nos necessitati esse subjectos, ut omni modo etiamsi nolimus vel mala vel bona agere cogamur.—

^e 2 Tim. ii. 21.

neither does our free will without the instruction of God, nor does the instruction of God, compel us to make a proficiency, unless we ourselves contribute something to the good : neither our free will without the instruction of God, and the exercise of this privilege of free will, causing any one to be to honour or dishonour ; nor the will of God alone making any one to honour or dishonour, unless he has some ground of difference, (namely) our will inclining towards what is good, or what is bad^e.”

And again shortly afterwards ; “ For it is not the same thing to have the power of conquering and to conquer, as the Apostle himself has pointed out in this very guarded expression ; ‘ God will make a way to escape, that ye may be *able* to bear it^f,’ not that ye *may* bear it. For many do not bear it, but are overcome by the temptation. God grants not that we may bear it, for then, it seems, there would be no struggle ; but that we may be able to bear it. But we make use of that power which is given us, to enable us to conquer, according to our free will, either with energy, and then we conquer ; or sluggishly, and then we are overcome. For if it were entirely given to us in every case to conquer, and by no means to be overcome, what cause of contest

^e ORIGEN. *de Princip.* l. iii. c. i. s. ult. — οὔτε τὸ ἐφ’ ἡμῶν χωρὶς τῆς ἐπιστήμης τοῦ Θεοῦ, οὔτε ἡ ἐπιστήμη τοῦ Θεοῦ προκόπτειν ἡμᾶς ἀναγκάζει, ἐὰν μὴ καὶ ἡμεῖς ἐπὶ τὸ ἀγαθὸν τι συνεισάγωμεν· οὔτε τοῦ ἐφ’ ἡμῶν χωρὶς τῆς ἐπιστήμης τοῦ Θεοῦ καὶ τῆς καταχρήσεως τοῦ κατ’ ἀξίαν

τοῦ ἐφ’ ἡμῶν, ποιούντος εἰς τιμὴν ἢ εἰς ἀτιμίαν γενέσθαι τινὰ· οὔτε τοῦ ἐπὶ τῷ Θεῷ μόνου κατασκευάζοντος εἰς τιμὴν ἢ εἰς ἀτιμίαν τινὰ, ἐὰν μὴ ὕλην τινὰ διαφορᾶς σχῇ τὴν ἡμετέραν προαίρεσιν κλίνουσαν ἐπὶ τὰ χεῖρονα, ἢ ἐπὶ τὰ κρείττονα.

^f 1 Cor. x. 13.

would remain to him who could not be overcome? or what would be the merit of victory, where there is not the power of resisting and conquering? But if the possibility of conquering be equally afforded to us all, but it remains in our own power how we use this possibility, whether with energy or sluggishly, the conquered will be justly blamed, and the conqueror justly rewarded^g.”

“If the day rises equally to all, and if the sun shines upon all with even and equal light, how much more does Christ, the true sun and day, give the light of eternal life in his church, with impartial equality. Of which equality we see that a symbol was displayed in the Exodus, when the manna descended from heaven, and prefiguring future things, pointed out the food of heavenly bread, and the meat of Christ who was to come. For there, without any discrimination, either of sex or of age, a gomer was equally gathered by each person. Whence it appeared, that the favour of Christ, and the heavenly grace hereafter to follow, are equally divided to all, without any regard to the difference of sex, without any discrimination of age, without any respect of persons; that the gift of spiritual grace is poured upon all the people of

^g ORIGEN. *de Princip.* l. iii. c. ii. s. 3. —A Deo autem datur, non ut sustineamus; alioquin nullum jam videretur esse certamen: sed ut sustinere possimus. Eâ autem virtute, quæ nobis data est, ut vincere possimus, secundum liberi ar-

bitrii facultatem aut industriè utimur, et vincimus; aut segniter et superamur. Si enim totum nobis hoc detur ut omni genere superemus, et nullo modo vincamur, quæ jam superest causa certandi ei qui vinci non potest? —

God. The same spiritual grace, which is received in an equal degree by believers at their baptism, is evidently afterwards either diminished or increased by our own conversation and conduct; as in the Gospel the seed mentioned by our Lord is sown equally, but according to the variety of the soil, some is wasted, and some increases to thirty-fold, or sixty-fold, or an hundred-fold^h.”

And Lactantius says :

“ We of every sex, race, and age, enter upon this heavenly journey, because God, who is the guide of this way, denies immortality to no human being who is born into the worldⁱ.”

“ He was without falsehood who said, that ‘ All things work together for good to them that love God^k.’ For God is abundant in doing good ; but he expects the sincere free will of every one. Therefore the Apostle added, saying, ‘ to them who are called according to his purpose.’ The existence of a sincere purpose makes you called ; for if you have your body here, and not your mind, it profiteth nothing^l.”

^h CYPRIANI *Ep.* lxxvi. *ad Magnum.* s. 10. —Unde apparebat Christi indulgentiam et celestem gratiam, postmodum secuturam, æqualiter omnibus dividi sine sexus varietate, sine annorum discrimine, sine acceptione personæ, super omnem Dei populum spiritalis gratiæ munus infundi. Planè eadem gratia spiritalis, quæ æqualiter in baptismo à credentibus sumitur, in conversatione atque

actu nostro postmodum vel minuitur vel augetur.—

ⁱ LACTANT. l. vi. *de Vero Cultu* c. 3. —quia Deus, qui ejus viæ dux est, immortalitatem nulli homini nato negat.

^k Rom. viii. 28.

^l CYRIL. HIEROS. *Præf. Catech.* —περιμένει δὲ ἐκάστων τὴν γνησίαν προαίρεσιν.—ἡ πρόθεσις γνησία οὖσα, κλητὸν σε ποιεῖ· καὶ γὰρ τὸ σῶμα ὁδε ἔχει, τὴν δὲ διάνοιαν μὴ ἔχεις, οὐδὲν ὠφελεῖ.

“ Know that baptism forgives past sins, and does not secure future righteousness, which is guarded by labour, and industry, and diligence, and always, above all things, by the mercy of God ; so that it belongs to us to ask, to him to give that which is asked ; to us to begin, to him to perfect ; to us to offer what we can, to him to complete what we cannot ^m. ”

ARTICLE XVII.

Of Predestination and Election.

“ PREDESTINATION to Life is the everlasting purpose of
 “ God, whereby (before the foundations of the World
 “ were laid) he hath constantly decreed by his Counsel,
 “ secret to us, to deliver from curse and damnation those
 “ whom he hath chosen in Christ out of mankind, and to
 “ bring them by Christ to everlasting salvation, as vessels
 “ made to honour. Wherefore they which be endued
 “ with so excellent a benefit of God, be called according
 “ to God’s purpose by his Spirit working in due season :
 “ they through grace obey the calling : they be justified
 “ freely : they be made sons of God by adoption : they be
 “ made like the image of his only-begotten Son Jesus

^m HIERON. *Dial. adv. Pelag.* l. iii. p. *init.* tom. iv. pars. 2^{da} p. 532. Hoc scito, baptismum præterita donare peccata,

non futuram servare justitiam, quæ labore, et industriâ, ac diligentiâ, et semper super omnia Dei clementiâ custoditur.—

“ Christ: they walk religiously in good works, and at length, by God’s mercy, they attain to everlasting felicity.

“ As the Godly consideration of Predestination, and our Election in Christ is full of sweet, pleasant, and unspeakable comfort to godly persons, and such as feel in themselves the working of the Spirit of Christ, mortifying the works of the flesh, and their earthly members, and drawing up their mind to high and heavenly things; as well because it doth greatly establish and confirm their faith of eternal Salvation, to be enjoyed through Christ, as because it doth fervently kindle their love towards God; so, for curious and carnal persons, lacking the Spirit of Christ, to have continually before their eyes the sentence of God’s Predestination, is a most dangerous downfall, whereby the devil doth thrust them either into desperation, or into wretchlessness of most unclean living, no less perilous than desperation.

“ Furthermore, we must receive God’s promises, in such wise, as they be generally set forth to us in holy Scripture; and in our doings, that Will of God is to be followed, which we have expressly declared unto us in the Word of God.”

There is so much difference of opinion amongst the members of our own Church, as to the *meaning* of this Article, that I shall not pretend to say, as has been done in former Articles, what errors it was intended to oppose. And though I find less difficulty in arriving at a distinct and definite persuasion on the doctrine here expressed than I do on other points, yet as the object of this work is not to express my own opinions, but to give those of the Fathers of the Church, I shall abstain from offering any remarks of my own, and select only

some of the strongest passages from the Fathers prior to Augustine. The Pelagian controversy led *him* to make use of expressions which might be urged in support of the doctrine of absolute predestination; but as a few extracts, either way, would not fairly represent his opinions, and as they could not be arrived at, (if they could be ascertained with any precision at all,) without entering at length into the controversy which first led him to speak strongly on the subject, it seems advisable to pass him over altogether. But, inasmuch as almost all the passages here adduced are opposed to the Calvinistic doctrine of absolute predestination, it may seem to some that the extracts are partially made, and with a view, notwithstanding the above profession of impartiality, to represent my own view of the question;—to which accusation, should it be made, the omission of Augustine as an authority may give weight. I can only again repeat that such omission is made solely from the difficulty of representing that Father's opinions within the brief limits of two or three pages.

“ Let us be spiritual, a temple perfect unto God; as far as is in our power let us cherish the fear of God, and earnestly strive to keep his commandments; that we may rejoice in his righteous judgments. The Lord judges the world without respect of persons. Each one will receive according to what he does. If he be good, goodness goes before him; if evil, the reward of wickedness follows him. Let us raise ourselves, lest now that we are called we should indolently sleep in our sins, and

the Evil one obtaining power over us, should exert himself and shut us out from the kingdom of the Lord. And moreover ponder upon that, when you see so many signs and wonders performed amongst the people of the Jews, and yet the Lord deserted them; Let us attend therefore lest we should experience the fulfilment of that Scripture ‘many are called, but few chosen ^{a.} ^{b.}’

Clemens Romanus and Ignatius, in some of their Epistles, address the Churches to which they wrote as being “called,” “predestinated before the world began unto eternal glory,” and “holy elect.”

“The Church of God which is at Rome to the Church of God which is at Corinth, called and sanctified by the will of God through our Lord Jesus Christ ^{c.}”

“Ignatius, who is also called Theophorus, to the Church which is at Ephesus in Asia, deservedly happy, being blessed through the greatness and fulness of God the Father, and predestinated before the world began, that it should be always unto an enduring and unchangeable glory; being united and chosen through actual suffering, according to the will of the Father ^{d.}”

^a Matt. xxii. 14.

^b BARNABÆ *Epist.* s. 4. p. 60. Simus spirituales, simus templum consummatum Deo: in quantum est in nobis, meditemur timorem Dei, et custodiamus mandata illius. Dominus, non acceptâ personâ, judicat mundum. Unusquisque secundum quæ facit, accipit: si fuerit bonus, bonitas eum antecedit;

si nequam, merces nequitiae eum sequitur.—

^c CLEM. *Rom. Ep. ad Corinth.* s. 1. Ἡ Ἐκκλησία τοῦ Θεοῦ ἡ παροικοῦσα Ῥώμην, τῇ Ἐκκλησίᾳ τοῦ Θεοῦ παροικοῦσῃ Κόρινθον, κλητοῖς, ἡγιασμένοις ἐν θελήματι Θεοῦ—

^d IGNAT. *Ep. ad Ephes.* s. 1. Ἰγνάτιος, ὁ καὶ Θεοφόρος, τῇ εὐλογημένῃ ἐν μεγέθει Θεοῦ πατρὸς πλη-

“ Ignatius, who is also called Theophorus, to the holy Church which is at Tralles in Asia, elect, worthy of God, having peace through the flesh, and blood, and passion, of Jesus Christ ^e.”

And Polycarp uses expressions very similar ; he begins his Epistle to the Philippians as follows : “ I rejoiced greatly with you in our Lord Jesus Christ, that ye have received the images of his true love, and have conducted, as behoved you, those who were fastened in bonds, becoming saints, which are the crowns of those who are truly chosen by God and our Lord : and that the root of your faith, which was preached in ancient times, remains firm to the present time, and brings forth fruit to our Lord Jesus Christ, ‘ who suffered himself to be brought even to death for our sins, whom God hath raised up, having loosed the pains of death. Whom, having not seen, ye love ; in whom, though you see him not, yet believing ye rejoice with joy unspeakable and full of glory ^f.’ Into which many desire to enter, knowing that ‘ by grace ye are saved ^g,’ not by works, but by the will of God, through Jesus Christ ^h.”

Justin Martyr, after proving from the prophecies in the Old Testament that Jesus is the promised Messiah, proceeds to answer an objection that may

ρώματι, τῇ προωρισμένη πρὸ αἰώνων διὰ παντὸς εἰς δόξαν παράμονον, ἄτρεπτον, ἡνωμένην, καὶ ἐκλελεγμένην ἐν πάθει ἀληθινῷ, ἐν θελήματι τοῦ Πατρὸς—τῇ Ἐκκλησίᾳ—

^e Idem *ad Trall.* s. 1. Ἰγνάτιος—ἐκκλησίᾳ ἁγίᾳ, τῇ οὕσῃ ἐν Τράλλεσιν τῆς Ἀσίας, ἐκλεκτῇ καὶ

ἀξιοθέῳ.—

^f Acts, ii. 24. 1 Pet. i. 8.

^g Eph. ii. 8.

^h POLYCARP. *Ep. ad Philipp.* s. 1.—ἃ τινὰ ἐστὶ διαδήματα τῶν ἀληθῶς ἐπὶ Θεοῦ, καὶ τοῦ Κυρίου ἡμῶν ἐκλελεγμένων.—

be made, viz. that if God had predestined the future, free will would be taken away :

“ But that no persons may suppose, from what I have now said, that I am asserting that the things which do happen must by fatal necessity come to pass, because I have said they are fore-known, I will explain this also. That retribution and punishment, as well as rewards, will be given to every one according to his works, we have learnt from the Prophets, and declare to be true. Since, if this were not so, but all things came to pass by a fatal necessity, then there is nothing at all in our power. For if it is fated that one man is to be good and another wicked, then neither is the one to be praised, nor the other blamed. And again, if mankind hath no power by free choice to flee the evil and to choose the good, they are not to blame for any actions of what kind soever. But that men do both act rightly and fall by their own free choice, we thus prove. We see the same man acting differently at different times ; but if it were fated that he should be either bad or good, he would not be capable of acting so differently, nor could he change so frequently. Neither in that case would some be good and others bad, for we should represent fate as the cause of the evil, and working contrary to itself ; or we must hold the before-mentioned opinion to be true, that virtue and vice are nothing, but that actions are to be accounted good or bad in opinion which, as true reason shews, is the greatest impiety and injustice. But we say that this is irreversibly fated, that upon

those who choose the good, the merited rewards shall be bestowed, and in like manner on those who choose the contrary, the merited punishment. For God did not make man as other things, trees, for instance, and four-footed beasts, without the power of doing any thing of their own choice ; since he would not be deserving of reward or praise, if he did not of himself choose the good, but were so made ; nor if he were bad could he justly meet with punishment, if he were not such by his own fault, but were not able to become in any respect different from what he was made.”

Our author then proceeds to prove his position from Scripture ; “ And these things the Holy prophetic Spirit taught us, saying by Moses, that God thus spake to the man who was first created ; “ Behold, before thy face is good and evil, choose the goodⁱ. ” He then quotes several verses from Isaiah^k to the same purpose, observes that Plato had taken the same opinion from Moses, and concludes his argument in these words ; “ So that when we say that things which were about to come to pass have been foretold, we do not assert that they are done by a fatal necessity ; but that God, foreknowing what things would be done by all men, and having determined within himself that he would reward every man according to his deeds, declared, by the prophetic Spirit, that they should obtain from him such retribution as their actions deserved, in this way always leading the human race to re-

ⁱ Deut. xxx. 15, 19.

^k Isaiah, i. 16—20.

flection and remembrance, shewing also his care and providence for them¹.”

And in his Dialogue with Trypho he reconciles the foreknowledge of God with the free will of man :

“ But that you may have no pretence for saying, that Christ must needs have been crucified, or that there must be in our generation some that transgress, and that it could not happen otherwise, I have already in few words observed, that God, willing that angels and men should follow his will, chose to put it in their own power to do righteousness, giving them reason whereby they might know by whom they are created, and through whom they have their being, not being before, and making a law that they should be judged by him, if they did any thing contrary to right reason. And we men, as also the angels, shall by ourselves be convicted of having done evil, if we do not timely repent. But if the word of God foreshews that some, as well angels as men, will certainly be punished, because he foreknew that they would be unchangeably wicked, he foretells these things; but God did not by any means make them be such. Wherefore, if they shall repent, all, who desire, are able to obtain mercy from God, and the Word declares

¹ JUSTIN. *Apol.* 1^a. s 43, 44.
 “Ὅπως δὲ μή τις ἐκ τῶν προλελεγμένων ὑφ’ ἡμῶν, δοξάσῃ καθ’ ἐμαρμένης ἀνάγκην φάσκειν ἡμᾶς τὰ γινόμενα γίνεσθαι, ἐκ τοῦ προειπεῖν, προεγνωσμένα, καὶ τοῦτο διαλύομεν. — εἰ δὲ εἴμαρτο ἡ φαῦλον ἢ σπου-

δαῖον εἶναι, οὐκ ἂν ποτε τῶν ἐναντίων δεκτικὸς ᾗν, καὶ πλειστάκις μετετίθετο —

— ὥστε ὁ φαμέν πεπροφητεῦσθαι τὰ μέλλοντα γίνεσθαι, οὐ διὰ τὸ ἐμαρμένης ἀνάγκη πράττεσθαι λέγομεν —

them blessed, saying, ‘Blessed is he to whom the Lord shall not impute sin^m.’”

In the preceding Article a passage was adduced from Irenæus opposed to the doctrine of irresistible grace; the continuation, which is applicable to our present subject, is as follows; “But God, foreknowing all things, has prepared fit habitations for both; to those who seek the light of incorruption, and run to it, kindly giving that light which they desire; but for others, who despise it, and turn away from it and avoid it, and, as it were, blind themselves, he has prepared darkness suitable to persons who dislike light; and upon those who will not be subject to it, he has inflicted appropriate punishmentⁿ.”

In another place he speaks of, “being predestinated according to the prescience of the Father^o.”

Clement of Alexandria, in the words of St. Peter^p, speaks of the Christians generally, as chosen or elect; “We are consecrated to God for the sake of Christ; we are a chosen generation, a royal priesthood, a holy nation^q.”

^m Idem *Dial.* c. 141.—εἰ δὲ ὁ λόγος τοῦ Θεοῦ προμηνύει πάντως τινὰς καὶ ἀγγέλους καὶ ἀνθρώπους κολασθήσεσθαι μέλλοντας, διότι προεγίνωσκεν αὐτοὺς ἀμεταβλήτους γεννησομένους πονηροῦς, προεῖπε ταῦτα, ἀλλ’ οὐχ ὅτι αὐτοὺς ὁ Θεὸς τοιούτους ἐποίησεν.—

ⁿ IRENÆI, l. iv. c. xxxix. s. 4. Deus autem omnia præsciens, utrisque aptas præparavit habitationes: eis quidem qui inquirunt lumen incorruptibilitatis, et ad id recurrunt, benignè do-

nans hoc quod concupiscunt lumen: aliis vero id contemnentibus, et avertentibus se ab eo, et id fugientibus, et quasi semetipsos excæcantibus, congruentes lumini adversantibus præparavit tenebras.—

^o Idem, l. v. c. l. s. 1.—prædestinati secundum præscientiam Patris.

^p 1 Pet. ii. 9.

^q CLEM. *Alex. Cohort. ad Gent.* c. iv. p. 52.—Ἡμεῖς τὰ γένος τὸ ἐκλεκτὸν, κ. τ. λ.

“ But we preach Christ crucified, unto the Jews indeed a stumbling-block ; because, knowing the prophecy, they do not believe the event ; but unto the Greeks foolishness ; for they who profess themselves to be wise, consider it as a fable, that the Son of God should speak in a human form, and that God should have a Son, and that he should suffer. From whence the prejudice of self-opinion over-persuaded them to disbelieve. For the coming of our Saviour did not make men foolish, and hard-hearted, and unbelieving, but wise, and easy to be persuaded, and moreover believers. But they who were unwilling to believe, by separating themselves from those who voluntarily obeyed, were proved to be unwise, and unbelievers, and foolish ; but unto them which are called, both Jews and Greeks, Christ is the power of God and the wisdom of God.—And being wise, they were in much greater fault for not believing the preaching, for the choice and adoption of the truth are voluntary.—All men, therefore, being called, those who were willing to obey were denominated *The Called*. For with God there is no injustice. Thus those of either race who believed, were ‘ a peculiar people.’ And in the Acts of the Apostles you find this expression ; ‘ Then they that [gladly] received his word, were baptized ^r ;’ but those who were not willing to believe, evidently alienated themselves. To these the prophecy says, ‘ If ye be willing and obedient, ye shall eat the good of the land ^s ;’ shewing that it

^r Acts, ii. 41.

^s Isaiah, i. 19.

rests with ourselves whether we will accept or reject^t."

Origen having strongly insisted on the free will of man, and that our actions are therefore deserving of praise or blame, continues; "If, therefore, innumerable motives to virtue and vice, and to what is becoming and unbecoming, be preserved to us, the result must necessarily be known to God with other things before they happen, from the creation and foundation of the world; and every thing which God preordained in consequence of what he saw would be in our power, he must have preordained consistently with the exercise of our free will in every instance, both what would take place according to his providence, and what would happen from the future relation of things; the pre-science of God not being the cause of events which were future, and which depended upon our own free will. For if we were to suppose that God did not foreknow what would happen, we should not the less do some things and will others^u."

Celsus, having objected that our Saviour having foretold that Peter would deny him, and that Judas would betray him, was himself the cause of these things coming to pass; for that if our Saviour was

^t CLEM. *Strom.* l. i. c. 18. p. 370, 371.—Πάντων τοίνυν ἀνθρώπων κεκλημένων, οἱ ὑπακούσαι βουληθέντες, κλητοὶ ὠνομάσθησαν· οὐ γὰρ ἔστιν ἀδικία παρὰ τῷ Θεῷ.

^u ORIGEN. *de Orat.* c. 6.—καὶ ἐν πᾶσιν οἷς προδιατάσσεται ὁ Θεὸς ἀκολουθῶς ὡς ἐώρακε, περὶ ἐκάστου ἔργου τῶν ἐφ' ἡμῖν προδια-

τάσσεται κατ' ἀξίαν ἐκάστῳ κινήματι τῶν ἐφ' ἡμῖν τὸ καὶ ἀπὸ τῆς προνοίας αὐτοῦ ἀπαντησόμενον, ἔτι δὲ καὶ κατὰ τὸν εἶρμόν τῶν ἐσομένων συμβησόμενον· οὐχὶ τῆς προγνώσεως τοῦ Θεοῦ αἰτίας γινομένης τοῖς ἐσομένοις πᾶσι, καὶ ἐκ τῶν ἐφ' ἡμῖν κατὰ τὴν ὁρμὴν ἡμῶν ἐνεργηθησομένοις.

God, these things must of necessity happen : Origen answers, “ Celsus thinks that that which was foretold by a certain foreknowledge, therefore came to pass, because it was foretold ; but we do not admit this, and we say that he who foretold was not the cause of that which was about to happen, because he declared beforehand that it would happen ; but that which was about to happen, since it would happen, although not foretold, gave occasion to him who foreknew it to declare it beforehand. And this is the whole that takes place in the foreknowledge of him that foretells ; *that is to say*, it being possible that a certain thing should happen, and it being also possible that it should not happen, this particular one will be that of the two which will happen. Nor do we say that he who foreknows is the cause that it is possible for a thing to happen or not to happen, as if he were to say some such thing as this ; ‘ this must by all means come to pass, and it is impossible that it should happen otherwise ^x.’ ”

“ ‘ The ungodly are froward even from their mother’s womb ; as soon as they are born, they go astray, and speak lies ^y.’ Thus Esau was froward from his mother’s womb, when it is announced that the elder shall serve the younger, even before he was born ; God not being ignorant of the future will, when the speaking of lies, and error of life,

^x Idem, c. Cels. l. ii. c. 20.
—ἡμεῖς δὲ τοῦτο οὐ διδόντες φαμέν
οὐχὶ τὸν θεσπίσαντα αἴτιον εἶναι τοῦ
ἰσομένου, ἐπεὶ προεῖπεν αὐτὸ γενη-
σόμενον, ἀλλὰ τὸ ἐσόμενον, ἰσόμενον

αὐν, καὶ μὴ θεσπισθὲν, τὴν αἰτίαν τῇ
προγιγνώσκοντι παρεσχηκέναι τοῦ
αὐτὸ προεῖπεν—

^y Ps. lvi. 3.

are from the mother's womb; he himself rather knowing this, than any one being born to the necessity and nature of sin. And that it might not be possible to impute the fault to their origin, he reproaches them with the crime of previously hardening their will against obedience. 'They are as venomous as the poison of a serpent, even like the deaf adder that stoppeth her ears; which refuseth to hear the voice of the charmer, charm he never so wisely.' The excuse of a certain natural necessity in crimes is not admitted. For the serpent might have been innocent, who himself stops his ears that they may be deaf^a."

"The Lord Jesus came to save all sinners; it was right that he should shew his will, even with respect to the ungodly; and therefore it was right that he should not pass over even him who was to betray him; that all might observe, that in the choice of his traitor, he displayed a sign that all were to be saved. Nor had either Adam reason to complain that he received the command, or Judas that he was chosen. For God did not impose upon the one the necessity of transgression, or upon the other that of treason; because both might have abstained from sin, if they had preserved that which they had received. Finally, he knew that all the Jews would not believe, and yet he said, 'I am not come except to the lost sheep of Israel.' There-

^a Ibid. lviii. 4, 5.

^a HILAR. *Tr. in Ps.* lvii. s. 3.—ipso potius hoc sciente, quam aliquo ad necessitatem

genito naturamque peccati.—Non excusatur quædam necessitas naturalis in crimine. Nam serpens innocens esse potuisset.

fore there is no fault in him who commands, but there is sin in him who transgresses. And as far as was in God, he shewed to all that he desired to deliver all. I do not, however, say that he did not know that there would be transgression; nay, I assert that he did know it^b."

In another place he is commenting on our Saviour's answer to the request of the mother of Zebedee's children; "To sit on my right hand, and on my left, is not mine to give, but it shall be given to them for whom it is prepared of my Father^c." Ambrose observes, "Christ added, 'for whom it is prepared,' that he might shew, that the Father is not wont to attend to petitions, but to merits, because God is no respecter of persons. Whence also the Apostle says, 'Whom he did foreknow, he also did predestinate^d;' for he did not predestinate before he foreknew, but he predestinated the rewards of those whose merits he foreknew^e."

"Although Scripture declared that Christ would be crucified, and although divine Scripture men-

^b AMBROSE *de Paradiso*, l. i. c. viii. s. 39. Venerat Dominus Jesus omnes salvos facere peccatores, etiam circa impios ostendere suam debuit voluntatem. Et ideo nec proditum debuit præterire; ut advertent omnes, quod in electione etiam proditoris sui servandorum omnium insigne prætendit, nec in eo læsus est, vel Adam, quia mandatum accepit, nec Judas, quia electus est.—Et

quod in Deo fuit, ostendit omnibus quod omnes voluit liberare. Nec tamen dico quia prævaricationem nesciebat futuram, immo quia sciebat adsero.

^c Matt. xx. 23.

^d Rom. viii. 29.

^e AMBROSE *de Fide* l. v. c. vi. s. 82, 83.—non enim ante prædestinavit, quam præsciret, sed quorum merita præscivit, eorum præmia prædestinavit.

tioned the sins which would be committed by us in the latter days, yet no one of us who commit sins can find an excuse, by producing the testimony of Scripture, foretelling that these things would happen. For we do not those things because Scripture foretold them; but Scripture foretold them because we were about to do them, through the foreknowledge of God^f.”

Chrysostom commenting on the 138th Psalm^g, in which David praises God for his providence, says; “Since many who are more obtuse in their understanding, and who have little sense, say many things of this kind, that God hath elected one man, and hath loved another, and hath hated a third, and that therefore one man has proved to be wicked, and another virtuous, he corrects such opinions of theirs, and convinces them from their actions, and adducing proof from their deeds, he shews that such a man was upright even before he performed those actions, in order that they may understand the power of his foreknowledge; and he adds the proof from their actions, in order that those foolish persons may not say, that any particular man was such because it was foretold he should be so. Consider also how Paul shews the very same thing, when he says, ‘For *the children* being not yet born, neither having done any good or evil, that the purpose of God according to

^f EPIPHAN: *adv. Hæres.* 1. iii. *Hæres.* xxxviii. c. 6.—Neque enim quod Scriptura prædixerat, iccirco ea facimus; sed

quod facturi eramus, Scriptura prædixit, ob antecedentem Dei videlicet cognitionem.

^g In our version, cxxxix.

election might stand, not of works, but of him that calleth; It was said unto her, The elder shall serve the younger.' For it is not necessary to wait the end of their deeds, but even before they are done, He knows, who will and who will not be wicked^r."

And in another place, giving a reason for the doubtful expressions used in Jeremiah, xxxvi. 3. "*It may be* that the house of Judah will hear all the evil which I purpose to do unto them:" Chrysostum says that if it had been expressly foretold as the fact proved, they *will not* hear, some might have said, "God foretold it, and therefore it must needs be; which they often say of Judas. 'He foretold,' they say, 'that he would be the traitor, and therefore he was the traitor.' What folly, what impudence is this! for foreknowledge, O man, is not the cause of wickedness; far from it; it does not make those things that will happen, of necessity to happen, it only foretells that they will happen. He was not the traitor because Christ foretold it; but Christ foretold it, because he was about to be the traitor^s."

Jerome commenting on Jeremiah xxvi. 3. 'If so be they will hearken, and turn every man from

^r CHRYSOST. in Ps. cxxxviii. —Οὐδὲ γὰρ δέεται ἀναμεῖναι τῶν ἔργων τὸ τέλος, ἀλλὰ καὶ πρὸ τούτων ὀδὸν αὐτὸς τὸν φαῦλον καὶ τὸν οὐ τοιοῦτον ἐσόμενον.

^s CHRYSOST. Hom. de Prophet. Obscuritate.—Ἰνα μὴ λέγῳσιν τινες, ὅτι προεῖπεν ὁ Θεὸς, καὶ πάντως ἔδει γενέσθαι· ὃ περὶ τοῦ Ἰούδα λέγουσιν· προεῖπέ, φησιν, ὅτι προδότης ἔσται, καὶ διὰ τοῦτο προδό-

της ἐγένετο. "Ὁ τῆς ἀνοίας, ὃ τῆς ἀνασχυρίας οὐδὲ γὰρ ἡ πρόγνωσις, ἀνθρωπε, τῆς πονηρίας αἰτία· μὴ γένοιτο· οὐ γὰρ ἔστιν ἀναγκαστικὴ τῶν μελλόντων ἔσεσθαι, ἀλλὰ προγνωστικὴ μόνον· οὐκ ἐπειδὴ προεῖπεν ὁ Χριστὸς, διὰ τοῦτο ἐγένετο ἐκείνος προδότης· ἀλλ' ἐπειδὴ προδότης ἔμελλε γενέσθαι, διὰ τοῦτο προεῖπεν ὁ Χριστός.

his evil way,' says, "The doubtful expression 'if so be,' cannot suit the majesty of the Lord, but he speaks after our manner, that free will may be preserved to man, lest from God's prescience, man should be compelled to do, or not to do, a thing, as by necessity. For a thing does not happen, because God knew it would happen; but because it would happen he knew it, being endowed with prescience of the future^t."

In another place he remarks on these words from Jeremiah, and similar expressions in Ezekiel, ii. 4, 5. and Luke xx. 13. "God speaks these things in the manner of a person doubting, that he may point out the free will of man; lest the foreknowledge of future evil or good should make that immutable which God knew would happen. For it is not necessary that we should do what he foreknew, because he knew it would happen; but because we were about to do it, by our own free will, he, as God, knew it would happen^u."

^t Hieron. in *Jerem.* c. xxvi. v. 3. p. 653.—Non enim ex eo quod Deus scit futurum aliquid, idcirco futurum est; sed quia futurum est, Deus novit, quasi præsciens futurorum.

^u Idem in *Ezek.* c. iii. v. 3.

p. 711.—Non enim quia ille ventura cognoscit, necesse est nos facere quod ille præscivit; sed quod nos propriâ voluntate sumus facturi; ille novit futurum quasi Deus.

ARTICLE XVIII.

*Of obtaining eternal Salvation only by the name
of Christ.*

“THEY also are to be had accursed that presume to say,
“ that every man shall be saved by the law or sect which
“ he professeth : so that he be diligent to frame his life
“ according to that law, and the light of nature. For
“ Holy Scripture doth set out unto us only the name of
“ Jesus Christ, whereby men must be saved.”

It has been usual with those who have classed our Articles under several divisions to consider the first five as containing the Christian doctrines concerning the Father, the Son, and the Holy Ghost ; the three following as establishing the rule of Faith ; and the next ten as relating to Christians as individuals ; and the remaining twenty-one, to them as members of a religious society. This eighteenth Article therefore was placed in the third division ; but it seems to me rather introductory to the fourth, if it may not be considered as constituting the beginning of the fourth division.

The nine preceding Articles declared the true and catholic doctrine in opposition to the various errors of persons professing themselves Christians :

this Article, though probably it was intended against some erroneous opinion held by Christians, seems rather to prepare the way for those which follow ; as if it had been said, “ it is not sufficient, for salvation, that a man belong to any religious society, for he can be saved by no other name than that of Jesus Christ :” this point being settled, the nineteenth Article proceeds to shew how the true Church of Christ is constituted.

“ Let us not then be insensible of his goodness, for should he have dealt with us according to our works we had not now had a being. Wherefore having become his disciples, let us learn to live according to the rules of Christianity, for whosoever is called by any other name besides this, he is not of God ^a.”

“ Let not any one be deceived. Both the beings which are above the heavens, the glorious order of Angels, and the invisible as well as visible powers, unless they believe in the efficacy of the blood of Christ, are obnoxious to judgment ^b.”

“ He is the door of the Father, by which Abraham, and Isaac, and the prophets, and the Apostles, and the church all enter ^c.” And again, in a passage already quoted at length, “ without him we have not the true life ^d.”

^a IGNAT. *ad Magnes.* s. 10.

—ὅς γὰρ ἄλλῃ ὀνόματι καλεῖται πλέον τούτου, οὐκ ἐστὶν τοῦ Θεοῦ.

^b Idem *ad Smyrn.* s. 6.

—ἐὰν μὴ πιστεύσωσιν εἰς τὸ αἷμα Χριστοῦ, κρκεῖνοις κρίσις ἐσ-
τίν.

^c Idem, *ad Philadelph.* s. 8.

Αὐτὸς ὡν θύρα τοῦ Πατρὸς, δι' ἧς εἰσέρχονται Ἀβραὰμ, καὶ Ἰσαάκ, κ. τ. λ.

^d Ante, Art. ii. *ad Trall.* s. 9.

Justin assures his opponent that his being descended from Abraham will be of no avail unless he has faith in Christ, and proceeds thus, “Wherefore cutting off this hope from your minds, you must strive earnestly to know in what way you may attain unto remission of sins, and to the hope of the inheritance of the good things that have been promised. But there is no other way than this, that acknowledging this Christ, and being washed with that baptism, which was preached by Isaiah, for the remission of sins, you may henceforward live without sin ^d.”

And Cyprian says, “There is no coming to the Father but by his Son Jesus Christ; as appears from what he says in the Gospel according to John; ‘I am the way, and the truth, and the life, no man cometh unto the Father, but by me ^{e, f}’”

“But because God is merciful and kind towards his creatures, he sent him (Christ) to those very persons whom he hated, that the way of salvation might not be for ever shut against them; but that he might give them a free power to follow God, that they might obtain the reward of life, if they did follow him, which many of them do, and have done: and that through their own fault they might incur the punishment of death, if they should reject

^d JUSTIN. *Dial.* c. 44. —
ἔστι δὲ οὐκ ἄλλη, ἢ αὕτη, ἵνα τοῦ-
τον τὸν Χριστὸν ἐπιγινόντες, καὶ
λουσάμενοι τὸ ὑπὲρ ἀφέσεως ἁμαρ-
τιῶν διὰ Ἡσαΐου κηρυχθέν λουτρὸν,
ἀναμαρτήτως λοιπὸν ζήσητε.

^e John, xiv. 6.

^f CYPRIAN. *Testim. ad Qui-
rin.* l. iii. c. 24. Non posse ad
Patrem pervenire, nisi per Fi-
lium ejus Jesum Christum, in
Evangelio κατὰ Joannem; *Ego
sum via, veritas, etc.*

their King. Therefore he ordered him to be born again among them, and of their seed, lest if he had been a stranger, they might out of their law have set up a reasonable pretence for not receiving him ; and at the same time that there might be no nation upon earth, to whom the hope of immortality was denied^s.”

ARTICLE XIX.

Of the Church.

“ THE visible Church of Christ is a congregation of faithful men, in the which the pure Word of God is preached, and the Sacraments be duly ministered, according to Christ’s ordinance, in all those things that of necessity are requisite to the same.

“ As the Church of Hiërusalem, Alexandria, and Antioch, have erred, so also the Church of Rome hath erred, not only in their living and manner of ceremonies, but also in matters of faith.”

The first part of this Article having given a definition of “the visible Church of Christ ;” the

^s LACTANT. l. iv. *de Verâ Sap.* c. 11. —sed daret his liberam facultatem sequendi Deum, ut et præmium vitæ adipiscerentur, si secuti fuissent, quod plurimi eorum faci-

unt, atque fecerunt, et culpâ suâ in pœnam mortis incurrerent si regem suum repudiassent.—simul, ut nulla omnino gens esset in terrâ cui spes immortalitatis negaretur.

latter asserts that certain particular Churches have erred. But the object of this assertion is to destroy the claim of Infallibility to which the Church of Rome pretends. It is not laid down generally that every particular Church is liable to err, for that would not so directly affect the Church of Rome; but the general principle of liability to error is certainly included in the particular assertion. The particular errors alluded to are specified in some of the subsequent Articles, and as that Church had not fallen into them in the first several centuries, it seems unnecessary here to shew that the Church of Rome did err during the period to which these extracts are limited. Neither need it be shewn that the Churches of Jerusalem and Antioch have erred. But it will be sufficient to adduce a few passages in support of the first assertion here made, leaving the proof of the fallibility of the Church of Rome to those Articles in which the particular errors of that Church are considered.

With regard to the first point contained in this Article, it may be observed, that “the visible Church, in its most extensive sense, may include all persons who are or have been, by outward profession, Christians, whether they have or have not believed all the doctrines, or obeyed all the precepts, of the Gospel.” This may be called the visible Catholic Church. But in this Article the “visible Church is used in a more limited sense, and comprehends only the Christians of one country or city, or of one persuasion ^a.”

^a TOMLINE on this Article.

The Church of Rome considers itself to be the only true Christian Church, and professedly denies salvation to all who differ from it; though it may be worth while to observe, that in the creed of pope Pius IV., article Twenty-third, it is admitted that there are other particular Churches; the words are, "I acknowledge the holy Catholic and Apostolic Roman Church, the mother and mistress of *all* Churches."

All that seems now to require proof is that the early Christians considered each body or congregation of Christians to constitute a particular Church, and so part of the visible Catholic Church. The marks of a true Church which constitute the definition, do not require proof; it will be sufficient, if our Church shall be proved to retain the same doctrines, and to administer the sacraments agreeably to the practice of the primitive Churches.

Clemens Romanus, Ignatius, and Polycarp, in writing epistles to the several Churches, address them as separate Churches, in the same sense as the expression 'visible Church' is used in this Article.

"The Church of God which is at Rome, to the Church of God which is at Corinth^b."

"Ignatius,—to the Church of Ephesus in Asia^c."

"Ignatius,—to the Church among the Trallians in Asia^d."

^b CLEM. ROM. cited ante, p. 224.

^c IGNAT. *ad Ephes.* s. 1. ante, p. 225.

^d Idem, *ad Trall.* s. 1 ante, p. 225.

Tertullian affords us a passage expressly to the purpose, and gives uniformity and truth of the doctrine as the marks of a true Church: "The Apostles having obtained the power of the Holy Ghost which was promised them, in order to work miracles, and to speak boldly, in all utterance; and having first borne their testimony to the faith in Jesus Christ throughout Judea, and planted Churches there, went afterwards into other parts of the world, and published the same doctrine of the same faith to the Gentiles; and so proceeded to found Churches in every city; from which afterwards other Churches borrowed and still continue to borrow the off-shoots of their faith, and the seeds of their doctrine, that so they might become Churches. And by this means they also are reputed Apostolical, as being the offspring of the Apostolical Churches. Every kind of which must be accounted of according to its original. And therefore so many and great Churches are nothing else but that primitive one, from which all the rest proceed. Thus they are all primitive, and all Apostolical, whilst they all agree in one and the same truth; whilst there is amongst them a communication of peace, and an appellation of brotherhood, and a league of hospitality; which rights are no otherwise to be preserved inviolable, than by an uniform delivery of the same doctrine^e."

^e TERTULL. *de Præscript. Hæret.* c. 20.—et proinde ecclesias apud unamquamque civitatem condiderunt, à quibus

traducem fidei et semina doctrinæ, cæteræ exinde ecclesiæ mutuatae sunt, et quotidie mutantur, ut ecclesiæ fiant:

In the greater part of this passage I have adopted the translation which is given in the English version of Welchman, but cannot agree with the translator, in rendering *ejusdem sacramenti traditio* "participation of the same holy sacrament." Tertullian is speaking of that one rule of faith which alone can be true, and which was delivered by the Apostles to the Churches which they planted, and from them to others; the mention of the holy sacrament is quite foreign to the occasion. Those who are acquainted with the Latin Fathers know that *sacramentum* is constantly used by them for "doctrine."

Traditio I have purposely translated "delivery," in order not to entangle myself in this place in a dispute about traditions. The passage in Tertullian that immediately follows the above, will be found under the sixth^f Article, and there the meaning of this word is canvassed.

In a subsequent part of the same work Tertullian speaks of different Churches as distinct, and at the same time speaks of the liability of particular Churches to fall into error :

"If therefore it is incredible, either that the Apostles had not a perfect acquaintance with all the Christian doctrines, or that they did not deliver

ac per hoc et ipsæ Apostolicæ deputantur, ut soboles Apostolicarum ecclesiarum. Omne genus ad originem suam censetur necesse est. Itaque tot ac tantæ ecclesiæ una est illa ab Apostolis prima, ex quâ omnes. Sic omnes primæ, et omnes Apos-

tolicæ, dum unâ omnes probant unitatem; communicatio pacis, et appellatio fraternitatis, et contesseratio hospitalitatis; quæ jura non alia ratio regit, quam ejusdem sacramenti una traditio.

^f Ante, p. 101.

to all the whole system of faith; let us see whether the Apostles did not simply and fully teach; but the Churches, through their own fault, received otherwise than the Apostles taught. All those minute and captious objections you may find advanced by the heretics. They lay hold of those Churches, which were rebuked by the Apostle, ‘O foolish Galatians who hath bewitched you^g? and ‘Ye did run well, who did hinder you^h? Again, at the very beginning, ‘I marvel that ye are so soon removed from him that called you unto the grace of Christ to another Gospelⁱ.’ So to the Corinthians it was written, ‘that they were yet carnal, to be fed with milk, and not yet fit for meat^k,’ ‘who thought that they knew something, when yet they knew nothing, as they ought to know^l.’ Since they object to the Churches, when they were rebuked, let them trust to them when they are reformed. At all events let them acknowledge those, on account of whose faith and knowledge and conversation the Apostle rejoices and gives thanks^m; which however communicate in the rights of one discipline with those that were rebukedⁿ.”

Lactantius says.

^g Gal. iii. 1.

^h Gal. v. 7.

ⁱ Gal. i. 6.

^k 1 Cor. iii. 1, 2.

^l 1 Cor. viii. 2.

^m Rom. i. 15. and xv. 14.

ⁿ TERTULL. *de Præscript. Hæret.* c. 27. Si ergo incredibile est, vel ignorasse Apos-

tolos plenitudinem prædicationis, vel non omnem ordinem regulæ omnibus edidisse: videamus ne Apostoli quidem simpliciter et plenè, ecclesiæ autem, suo vitio, aliter acceperint, quam Apostoli præferabant.—

“But because every assembly of heretics think themselves principally to be Christians, and that their’s is the catholic Church; we must know, that that is the true Church, wherein there is confession and repentance, which wholesomely cures the sins and wounds, to which the frailty of the flesh is subject^o.” He had just before said; “For when they are called Phrygians, or Novatians, or Valentinians, or Marcionites, or Anthropians, or Arians, or the like, they cease to be Christians, who, bearing the name of Christ, have assumed human and external appellations. The only catholic Church therefore is that which retains true worship^p.”

Cyril of Jerusalem explains the meaning of the confession of belief “in one holy Catholic Church.” It will be seen that he speaks of the Church of Christ as one, and yet that there were many true Churches all members of the one invisible Church.

“‘And in one holy Catholic and Apostolic Church,’ of which much might be said, but I will now touch upon it briefly. It is therefore called Catholic, because it is extended over the whole world, from one extreme of the earth to the other, and because it teaches catholically and fully all the doctrines which should come to the knowledge of man, about things visible and invisible, heavenly and earthly: and because it brings all men, whether

^o LACTANT. *de Verá Sap.*
l. iv. c. ult. —sciendum est,
illam esse veram (ecclesiam) in
quâ est confessio, et pœnitentia,
quæ peccata et vulnera, quibus

subjecta est imbecillitas carnis,
salubriter curat.

^p Idem, *ibid.* —Sola igitur
catholica ecclesia est, quæ verum
cultum retinet.

governors or the governed, whether nobles or private persons, into obedience unto holiness; and because it catholically cures and heals every kind of sin, both those committed by the soul and those by the body, and contains within it every kind of virtue, by whatever name it be called, in deeds and words, and all kinds of spiritual graces. And it is aptly called the Church because all are called and assemble together, as the Lord speaks in Leviticus; ‘Gather thou all the congregation together unto the door of the tabernacle of the congregation^q.’ But after that the Jews, on account of the plots contrived against the Saviour, were cast off from grace, the Saviour set in order a second Church of the nations, which is our holy Christian Church; of which he said to Peter; ‘Thou art Peter, and upon this rock I will build my Church; and the gates of hell shall not prevail against it^r.’ But of both these David prophecyng, spake plainly; of the first that it should be cut off, ‘I have hated the congregation of the wicked^s,’ but of the second, which should be built, he says in the same Psalm, ‘Lord I have loved the beauty (habitation) of thy house^t’ and immediately afterwards, ‘In the congregations will I bless thee, O Lord^u.’ For when this one was cast off, then the Churches of Christ were multiplied over the whole world.—But since the name *Ecclesia* is given to different things, as it is written of the multitude assembled in the

^q Levit. viii. 3.^r Matt. xvi. 18.^s Ps. xxvi. 5.^t Ibid, 8.^u Ibid, 12.

theatre of the Ephesians, “ And when he had thus spoken, he dismissed the assembly (Ecclesia);’ and any one might say correctly and truly that the conventicles of heretics, such as the Manichæans, and others, constitute an assembly (Ecclesia) of the wicked, therefore the faith has, in order to your security, commanded you to say, ‘ And in one Catholic Church,’ that you may avoid their foul conventicles, and ever continue in the holy Catholic Church, in which also you were regenerated. And if you go into strange cities, enquire not merely, where is the Lord’s house; for all the heresies of the ungodly, presume to call their dens the Lord’s houses. Nor ask merely where is the Church, but where is the Catholic Church: for this is the peculiar name of this holy Church which is the mother of us, and the bride of our Lord Jesus Christ the only-begotten Son of God ^x. ”

^x CYRIL. *Hieros. Catech.* οἰκουμένης αἱ τοῦ Χριστοῦ πλη-
 18.—Τῆς γὰρ ἐν τῇ Ἰουδαίᾳ μιᾷς θύουσιν ἐκκλησίαις.—
 ἀποβληθείσης, κατὰ πάσης τῆς

ARTICLE XX.

Of the Authority of the Church.

“THE Church hath power to decree rites or ceremonies, and authority in controversies of faith: and yet it is not lawful for the Church to ordain any thing that is contrary to God’s word written, neither may it so expound one place of Scripture that it be repugnant to another. Wherefore, although the Church be a witness, and a keeper of Holy Writ, yet as it ought not to decree any thing against the same, so besides the same ought it not to enforce any thing to be believed for necessity of salvation.”

The preceding Article having described in what the Church consists; the present declares generally what power and authority it possesses.

But it is important to observe that the word “Church” seems in this place to have a more extensive signification than in the nineteenth Article. Dr. Hey says^a, “If all Christians are united, it means the Catholic Church of one generation; if not, it means any particular Church, which can properly be called a Church.” This explanation may be considered as tolerably correct, though it would perhaps be more proper to say that “the Church” here includes both the Catholic or Universal Church collectively, and all particular Churches separately forming a part of the Catholic

^a See Art. xx. s. 2.

Church. This definition will exclude, or certainly not include, voluntary societies of Christians which have separated themselves from the Apostolic Churches; for it is difficult to discover any grounds for their power to decree rites and ceremonies, or for any authority they can have in controversies of faith.

The least correct expression in Dr. Hey's definition, unless it be cautiously interpreted, is that of "the Catholic Church of *one generation*." If limited to *new* subjects of controversy, the expression is unobjectionable, for as Scripture truth must always be one and the same, a decision of the Catholic Church, in a *former* generation, on any question of doctrine, is binding on the Church throughout *all* generations, provided only that it is according to the written word of God. So that whenever an ancient heresy, which has been already determined by a preceding General Council, is revived, the Catholic Church of one generation cannot treat it as a subject of controversy, but must act on the prior decision.

From the present condition of the Church it seems scarcely possible that a General Council should be assembled in these days; so that if a particular Church, constitutionally forming a part of the Church Catholic, should fall into heresy, the course pursued in former times, of the condemnation of such heresy by all the component parts of the Catholic Church, seems impracticable, and therefore particular or national Churches can only refuse them communion. If a heresy arises within,

without extending throughout, a particular Church, then such Church may decide the question, and its decision should be considered to have great weight and influence, and should be received, unless there is strong and irresistible proof that the decision is erroneous.

Having thus given a general explanation of the meaning of the Article, we may proceed to remark, that the first part of the Article has reference to the Puritans, who, at the period of the Reformation, carried their hatred to the Church of Rome to such an extent, as to object to all appointed ceremonies; and therefore our Church declares that “the Church hath *power to decree* rites and ceremonies.”

The Romanists maintained that the Church is infallible, and such infallibility having been denied, at least to particular Churches, in the preceding Article, it became necessary to determine its authority in controversies of faith. This is done in the second place, but with the re-assertion of the paramount authority of Scripture, as the rule by which all controversies must be determined. Again, the Church of Rome did then, as it still does, endeavour to identify itself with the Universal Church, and denied to any other particular Church, not in communion with Rome, any authority whatsoever.

For the purpose of illustration or proof, the two assertions, first, of the power of the Church to decree rites or ceremonies, and secondly, its authority in controversies of faith, may be put together, for

almost all the great general and provincial councils were assembled for both purposes.

The first general Council, held at Nice A. D. 325, and of which some account has been given under the eighth Article, is conclusive on the point : though, were it necessary, all the general, and the many provincial councils held at various times and places, might be referred to.

What passed at the Council of Nice is so well known, that it is unnecessary to quote the very words at length. Suffice it to observe, that a question of faith was there determined ; viz. the divinity of Christ, and that he is of one substance with the Father ; secondly, the time of celebrating Easter was settled, which is a mere rite or ceremony ; and moreover, twenty canons were enacted for the better ordering of the Church.

It is an undisputed fact that the decisions of this and the following general councils were recognised by the Catholic Church throughout the world ; and it is equally certain that the decisions of provincial councils were recognised, as far, at least, as their authority extended. But the opinions of individual writers may be subjoined in further proof of the fact.

Eusebius, speaking of the Nicene Council, says, “ The question being raised concerning the most holy feast of Easter, it seemed by common consent to be right that all, in all places, should celebrate it on the same day ^b.”

^b EUSEB. *in Vita Constantini*, l. iii. c. 17. “Ενθα καὶ περὶ τῆς τοῦ πάσχα ἀγιωτάτης ἑορτῆς

γενημένης ζητήσεως, ἔδοξε κοινῇ γνώμῃ καλῶς ἔχειν ἐπὶ μιᾷς ἡμέρας πάντας τοὺς ἀπανταχοῦ ἐπιτελεῖν.

And Athanasius says; “The Nicene Council was gathered together by reason of the Arian heresy, and on account of the feast of Easter; because the Syrians, Cilicians, and Mesopotamians differed from us, and celebrated it at the same time that the Jews do the Passover^c.”

And in the same letter he says, “But thanks be to the Lord, that as concerning the faith, so also concerning the holy feast, we were all of one mind^d.”

And in another place, “For the faith which the Council confesseth in writing is the faith of the Catholic Church^e.”

And Augustine, speaking of the much contested question, whether heretics should be re-baptized or not, refers to the authority of the Church. “Although no certain example of this thing can be adduced out of the canonical Scriptures, yet in this very thing we uphold the truth of the same Scriptures, when we do that which pleaseth the whole Church, which the authority of the Scriptures themselves commandeth; that, since the holy Scripture cannot deceive, whosoever fears to be deceived in the obscurity of this question, let him consult the same Church concerning it, which, without any ambiguity, the holy Scripture demonstrates^f.”

^c ATHANAS. *Ep. ad Episcop. African.* Ἡ μὲν γὰρ διὰ τὴν Ἀρειανὴν αἵρεσιν καὶ διὰ τὸ πάσχα συνήχθη, κ. τ. λ.

^d Idem, *ibid.* Ἀλλὰ χάρις τῷ Κυρίῳ, ὥσπερ περὶ τῆς πίστεως, οὕτως καὶ περὶ τῆς ἀγίας ἑορτῆς

γέγονε συμφωνία.

^e Idem *in Syn. Nic. c. Hær. Arian. Decret.* Ἦν γὰρ ἡ σύνοδος ἐγγράφως ὁμολόγησε, πίστις αὐτῇ τῆς καθολικῆς ἐκκλησίας ἐστί.

^f AUGUST. *c. Cresc. Grammat. l. i. c. 33.* Proinde, quam

ARTICLE XXI.

Of the Authority of General Councils.

“ GENERAL Councils may not be gathered together without
“ the commandment and will of Princes, and when they
“ be gathered together, (forasmuch as they be an assem-
“ bly of men, whereof all be not governed with the Spirit
“ and Word of God) they may err, and sometimes have
“ erred, even in things pertaining unto God. Wherefore
“ things ordained by them, as necessary to Salvation, have
“ neither strength nor authority, unless it may be declared
“ that they be taken out of Holy Scripture.”

The authority of General Councils is here rather limited, than declared; and therefore, though the Church of England, recognises that authority within the limits here laid down, it seems unnecessary in this place to shew that herein ours agrees with the primitive Churches.

That General Councils are liable to err and have erred, need not be proved. No one can deny it; unless it can be shewn that a direct contradiction is no contradiction at all.

vis hujus rei certum de Scripturis canonicis non proferatur exemplum, earundem tamen Scripturarum etiam in hac re à nobis tenetur veritas, cum hoc facimus, quod universæ jam placuit Ecclesiæ, quam ipsarum Scripturarum commendat au-

toritas; ut, quoniam sancta Scriptura fallere non potest, quisquis falli metuit hujus obscuritate quæstionis, eandem Ecclesiam de illâ consulat, quam sine ullâ ambiguitate sancta Scriptura demonstrat.

The last point asserted in this Article, that “things ordained by them, as necessary to salvation, have neither strength nor authority, unless it may be declared that they be taken out of Holy Scripture,” is sufficiently illustrated by the extracts from the Fathers given under the sixth Article.

It only remains then to shew that General Councils may not be gathered together without the commandment and will of princes.

Many National and Provincial Councils were assembled before the time of Constantine the Great, but no General one, until the Nicene Council was called together by his authority, in the year 325.

Eusebius says of Constantine; “He, having mustered the army of God to himself, gathered together an œcumenical synod, by his honourable letters commanding the bishops from all places to hasten together ^a.”

And Socrates says; “The emperor therefore seeing the Church troubled with these two things, gathered together an œcumenical synod, summoning by his letters the bishops from all places to meet at Nice, a city of Bithynia ^b.”

And the Council itself acknowledged the emperor’s authority, thus writing to the Church of Alexandria, “Seeing that by the grace of God, and the command of the most holy emperor, that gathered

^a EUSEB. *de Vita Constant.*
l. iii. c. 6. ——— σύνοδον οἰκου-
μενικὴν συνεκρότει, σπεύδειν ἀπαντα-
χόθεν τοὺς ἐπισκόπους γράμμασι
τιμητικοῖς προκαλούμενος.

^b SOCRAT. *Hist. Eccl.* l. i.
c. 8. ——— σύνοδον οἰκουμενικὴν
συνεκρότει, τοὺς πανταχόθεν ἐπισκό-
πους διὰ γραμμάτων εἰς Νίκαιαν τῆς
Βιθυνίας ἀπαντῆσαι παρακαλῶν.

us together from several cities and provinces, this great and holy Council is met at Nice ^c.”

The second General Council met at Constantinople in the year 381, by command of Theodosius the Great; “The emperor without delay calls together a Council of bishops of his faith, to confirm the faith established at Nice and to ordain a bishop for Constantinople ^d.”

The third was assembled at Ephesus in the year 431, by command of Theodosius the younger; and the fourth at Chalcedon in 451, by the emperor Marcion; but as these bring us down lower than the period to which our proofs are limited, it will suffice to refer to authorities ^e.

The above historical proofs of the fact, and the recorded admissions of the Councils themselves are enough to shew that from the time of Constantine, the first Christian emperor, the authority of princes was not questioned by the primitive Church. But I will subjoin three individual testimonies in support of this Article.

Chrysostom, shortly after his banishment from Constantinople, wrote a circular letter to Innocent bishop of Rome, Venerius bishop of Milan, and Chromatius bishop of Aquileia, in which he requests of them to write to the East, declaring that the

^c Idem, l. i. c. 9. Ἐπειδὴ τῆς τοῦ Θεοῦ χάριτος καὶ τοῦ θεοφιλεστάτου βασιλέως Κωνσταντίνου, συναγαγόντος ἡμᾶς ἐκ διαφόρων πολεώντε καὶ ἐπαρχιῶν, μεγάλη καὶ ἁγία σύνοδος ἐν Νικαίᾳ συνεκροτήθη.

^d Idem, l. v. c. 8. Μηδὲν δὲ

ὁ βασιλεὺς ὑπερθέμενος σύνοδον ἐπισκόπων τῆς αὐτοῦ πίστεως συγκαλεῖ, κ. τ. λ.

^e Vide *Concil. Ephes. ad Imperat. Evagr.* l. i. c. 3. et *Act. Concil. Chalced.*

measures taken by his enemies against him were illegal; this letter contains one expression which bears directly on this Article; he says, “I was again invited to the city and the church, from which I had been unjustly expelled, and was accompanied by more than thirty bishops, and a public officer who was sent by the most pious emperor for this purpose: but Theophilus immediately fled; and for what reason?—because when I entered, I entreated the most pious emperor to assemble a council for the punishment of those things that had been done^f.”

And Jerome says, “Answer, I desire thee, the council by which he was excommunicated, in what city was it? Tell the names of the bishops, produce the sentences of the subscriptions, either their diversity or agreement. Teach us, who were consuls that year, what emperor commanded this synod to be gathered together^g.”

Lastly, Socrates writes; “We often mention the emperors in our history, because from the time that they became Christians, the affairs of the Church depended on them, and the greatest Councils both were and still are gathered together by their command^h.”

^f CHRYSOST. *Ep. in Innocent. Episc. Romæ.* ———
εἰσιόντες παρεκαλοῦμεν τὸν θεοφιλέστατον βασιλέα, σύνοδον συναγαγεῖν εἰς ἐκδικίαν τῶν γεγενημένων.

^g HIERON. *Apol. 2. adv. Ruffin.* —Doce qui eo an-

no consules fuerint, quis imperator hanc synodum jusserit congregari?

^h SOCRAT. *Hist. Eccl. l. v. proem.* —καὶ αἱ μέγισται συνέδοι τῇ αὐτῶν γνώμῃ γεγονόασιν τε καὶ γίνονται.

ARTICLE XXII.

Of Purgatory.

“ THE Romish doctrine concerning Purgatory, Pardons, worshipping and adoration, as well of Images as of Reliques, and also invocation of Saints, is a fond thing vainly invented, and grounded upon no warranty of Scripture, but rather repugnant to the Word of God.”

Five doctrinal errors of the Church of Rome are here repudiated, as grounded upon no warranty of Scripture. Each must be noticed in its turn ; but the Articles of the creed of pope Pius IV. may be placed together.

The nineteenth and three following articles of that creed are as follows :

“ I constantly hold, that there is a Purgatory, and that the souls detained therein, are helped by the suffrages of the faithful.

“ Likewise, that the saints, reigning together with Christ, are to be honoured and invoked ; that they offer prayers to God for us, and that their relics are to be venerated.

“ I most firmly assert, that the images of Christ, and of the Mother of God, ever a Virgin, and also of the other saints, are to be had and retained, and that due honour and veneration are to be given to them.

“I also affirm, that the power of Indulgences was left by Christ in the Church, and that the use of them is most wholesome to Christian people.”

First, then, *Of Purgatory.*

It must be admitted that the practice of praying for the dead was by no means uncommon in the third century. It is mentioned in several places by Tertullian and Cyprian, and appears from several of the ancient liturgies. At what period the doctrine of Purgatory arose is not so easy to determine. Nor can we expect to find any passages in the early Fathers condemning or even alluding to such a doctrine, inasmuch as they only thought of two states after this life. Augustine is one of the first who speaks of Purgatory as a third state, and by no means pretends that there is any warrant of Scripture for receiving it as a Christian doctrine. He says in one place ^a, that “it does not seem incredible;” and in other places he expresses himself very doubtfully.

In a passage presently given at length, Cyprian says; “There is no confession in hell ^b.”

Cyril of Jerusalem, speaking of the resurrection of the dead, of the future judgment, and of some texts of Scripture bearing on those points, but perverted from their proper meaning, says :

“For if he says ‘The ungodly shall not rise again in judgment^c,’ the meaning is, that they

^a AUGUST. *ad Dulcitii Quæstion.* 1.

^b CYPRIAN. Ep. lii. s. 11.

Exomologesis apud inferos non est.

^c Ps. i. 6.

shall not in judgment, but they shall in condemnation: for God stands not in need of much enquiry; but coinstantaneously with the resurrection of the ungodly, punishment will overtake them. And if he says, ‘The dead shall not praise thee, O Lord^d:’ this shews, that in this life only we have an appointed time for repentance and remission of sins, for which they that reap the benefits of it will praise thee^e. For it is not permitted to those, who have died in their sins, to praise God, as receiving good from him, but they have only to lament: for praise is the part of those who give thanks, but lamentation of those that are tormented. The righteous therefore shall then offer up praises; but they that have died in their sins, have no time left for confession. For consider the consequence of that sentence, ‘He that goeth down to the grave shall come up no more^f:’ for it is written ‘he shall not come up, he shall return no more to his own house^g.’ But when the whole world shall have passed away, and every house have been destroyed, how shall he return to his own house, when the earth no longer remains^h.”

If Cyril had entertained the Romish doctrine of Purgatory, he could not have made use of such language as the above; he speaks only of two states after this life ended, and at all events ex-

^d Ps. cxv. 17.

^e Ibid, 18.

^f Job, vii. 9.

^g Ibid, 10.

^h CYRIL. *Hieros. Catech.*

xviii. οἱ μὲν οὖν δίκαιοι τότε αἰνοῦσιν, οἱ δὲ τελευτήσαντες ἐν ἁμαρτίαις, καιρὸν λοιπὸν ἐξομολογήσεως οὐχ ἔχουσι.

pressly denies the possibility of obtaining pardon in the next world, by means of any after-act.

Secondly, of Pardons.

In the primitive Churches very severe penalties were inflicted on those who had been guilty of any sins, whether public or private; these penalties chiefly consisted of a temporary or continual denial of communion with the Church, to the offender, with the addition of various acts of penance to be done or suffered by him, in token of repentance and submission. The Council of Nice, as a matter of Church discipline, gave the bishops power to relax or remit these punishments: but in the eleventh century the Roman see claimed to itself the power of granting pardons or indulgences either as the rewards of meritorious actions, or in consideration of a sum of money, and these indulgences they pretended would deliver the purchaser from Purgatory, either for a limited time or entirely. The foundation of these pardons, however, was laid in the Romish doctrine of works of supererogation; that Church holds that "many holy men have suffered more for God and righteousness' sake than the guilt of the temporal punishment, which they were obnoxious to for faults committed by them, could exact¹;" and that these good deeds form a common treasure, which the Church has power to apply for the satisfaction of the sins of others.

"I hear also that an edict has been put forth, and that indeed a peremptory edict. The chief

¹ BELLARM. *de Indulgent.*

Pontiff truly, the Bishop of Bishops says, 'I absolve those, who have done penance, from the sins of adultery and fornication.' O edict to which *Bonum factum* cannot be prefixed^k."

Cyprian is speaking of those who had joined in the heathen sacrifices in time of persecution: part of the passage has been given a few pages back, the whole is as follows; "Aid must be given in their last moments to those that have sacrificed, because there is no confession in hell, nor can any one be urged to repentance by us, if the fruits of repentance be taken away. If the battle shall come first, being strengthened by us, he will be found armed for the battle, but if infirmity shall burn within him before the battle, he departs with the consolation of peace and communion: for we do not forejudge the judgment of the Lord; but that, if he shall find the repentance of a sinner full and just, he may then ratify what has been here determined by us: but if any one shall have deceived us by a feigned repentance; God, who is not mocked, and who sees into the heart of man, may judge concerning those things which we had not well discovered, and the Lord may correct the sentence of his servants¹."

^k TERTULL. *de Pudicit*, c. 1. Audio etiam edictum esse propositum, et quidem peremptorium; Pontifex scilicet Maximus, Episcopus Episcoporum dicit; Ego et mœchiæ et fornicationis delicta pœnitentiâ functis dimitto. O edictum cui adscribi non poterit, Bonum

factum. Edicts usually had prefixed to them these words, *Bonum factum est edicta ut servetis mea*. See PLAUT. in *Penulo*.

¹ CYPRIAN *Ep. lii. ad Antonium de Cornelio et Novatiano*. s. 11.—neque enim præjudicamus Domino judicaturò,

“Let no one deceive himself; the Lord alone can have mercy. Pardon to sins, which have been committed against him, he alone can grant, who bore our sins, who suffered for us, whom God gave for our sins. Man cannot be greater than God: nor can the servant remit or pardon by his indulgence, that more grievous offence which has been committed against the Lord. Let not this also be added to the crime of the lapsed, that he should forget the prophecy, ‘Cursed be the man that trusteth in man.’ The Lord must be entreated; the Lord must be appeased by our own satisfaction; who has said that he will deny those that deny him, who alone hath received all judgment from the Father.”

“We believe indeed that the merits of martyrs, and the works of just men avail much with our Judge; but that will be, when the day of judgment shall come, when after the fall of this age and world, his people shall stand before the judgment-seat of Christ. But if any one with premature haste, is so rash as to think that he can grant to any remission of sins, or dares to rescind the Lord’s precepts, so far is he from benefiting, that he injures, the lapsed ^m.”

quo minus si pœnitentiam plenam et justam peccatoris invenerit, tunc ratum faciat quod à nobis fuerit hîc statutum; si verò nos aliquis pœnitentiæ simulatione deluserit; Deus qui non deridetur, et qui cor hominis intuetur, de his quæ nos minus perspeximus judicet, et

servorum sententiam emendet.

^m Idem, *de Lapsis*. s. 14.— Veniam peccatis, quæ in ipsum commissa sunt, solus potest ille largiri, qui peccata nostra portavit, qui pro nobis doluit, quem Deus tradidit pro peccatis nostris. Homo Deo esse non potest major: nec remittere

Athanasius urges Christ's power of forgiving sins, as a proof of his divinity :

“How, if the Word was a creature, could he loose the sentence of God, and pardon sin, it being written by the Prophets, that this belongs to God ; for ‘who is a God like unto thee, that pardoneth iniquity, and passeth by transgressionsⁿ’? ‘For God said, ‘Dust thou art, and unto dust shalt thou return^o :’ so that men are mortal ; how then was it possible that sin should be pardoned by created beings ? but the Lord himself did pardon them^p.”

And Ambrose says : “This cannot be common to any man with Christ to forgive sins. This is the prerogative of Christ alone, who took away the sins of the world^q.”

And Chrysostom : “For no one can pardon sins except God alone^r.”

Thirdly, *Worshipping and adoration of Images.*

Though almost all those passages in the early Christian writers, which denounce the worshipping of images, were directed against the Heathens,

aut donare indulgentiâ suâ servus potest, quod in Dominum delicto graviore commissum est.—

ⁿ Micah, vii. 18.

^o Genes. iii. 19.

^p ATHANAS. c. *Arian. Oral.*

iii. Πῶς δὲ, εἶπερ κτίσμα ἦν ὁ Λόγος, τὴν ἀπόφασιν τοῦ Θεοῦ λύσαι δυνατὸς ἦν, καὶ ἀφεῖναι τὴν ἁμαρτίαν, γεγραμμένου παρὰ τοῖς προφήταις, ὅτι τοῦτο Θεοῦ ἔστι— πῶς γὰρ οἷόν τε ἦν παρὰ τῶν γένητῶν λυθῆναι τὴν ἁμαρτίαν ;—

^q AMBROSE. *Ep. lxxvi. ad Studium.* Non potest hoc cuiquam hominum cum Christo esse commune, ut peccata condonet. Solius hoc munus est Christi, qui tulit peccatum mundi.

^r CHRYSOST. *in 2 ad Cor. Hom. vi. s. 4.* Οὐδεὶς γὰρ δύναται ἀφίεναι ἁμαρτίας, εἰ μὴ μόνος ὁ Θεός.

yet it is clear that they considered the use of them in the Christian Church to be forbidden; for this was one of the things with which the Heathens reproached them, that they had no images. In the fourth century the painting the walls of churches with pictures was condemned by the Council of Eliberis^s: “It pleases us to have no pictures in Churches, lest that which is worshipped should be painted on the walls.” In the fifth century images seem to have been introduced; and in the eighth arose the famous controversy about breaking of images. Different Popes have taken different sides of the question, but the Council of Trent, as we have seen, decrees that “due honour and veneration are to be given to them.”

“Can you deny with your tongue, what you confess with your hand? pull down in word what you build up in deed? Can you preach one God, who make so many? the true God, who make false Gods? I make them, he says, but I do not worship them. As if there were any other reason for which he dares not worship them, than that for which he ought not to make them, viz.; that in both cases it is an offence against God. Moreover you do worship them, in making them that they may be worshipped. But you worship them not with the breath of any vile smell, but with your own; not with the life of some purchased animal, but with your own soul^t.”

^s Can. xxxvi.

^t TERTULL. *de Idololatriâ*.
c. 6. Potes linguâ negasse,
quod manu confiteris? Verbo

destruere, quod facto struis?
Unum Deum prædicare, qui tan-
tos efficis? verum Deum prædi-
care, qui falsos facis? Facio (ait

Celsus objected, that the Christians, in worshipping one who was dead, acted like “the Getæ, who worshipped Zamolxis, the Cilicians who worshipped Mopsus, the Acarnani who worshipped Amphilo-chus, the Thebans who worshipped Amphiaraus, and the Lebadians who worshipped Trophonius.” “Here, too,” says Origen, “I will convict him of having without good reason compared us to those people above mentioned: for they erect temples and statues to the deities whom he has enumerated; but we have rejected from our worship of the Deity any honour that may be derived through such means, as more suited to evil spirits, who are consecrated, I know not how, in some place, which they have chosen, or have been led there by some mystic rites and magical incantations, and, as it were, fix there their habitation; and we worship Jesus, who has withdrawn our mind from every sensible object, as not only liable to corruption, but as of necessity to be corrupted, and has led us to give honour to Him who is God over all, with upright lives and with prayers, which we offer up through him, who is, as it were, midway between increated and created nature, and who gives to us blessings from the Father, and as a priest carries our prayers to Him who is God over all.”^u

quidam) sed non colo. Quasi ob aliam causam colere non audeat, nisi ob quam et facere non debeat, scilicet ob Dei offensam utrobique. Imo tu colis, qui facis ut coli possint. Coli autem non spiritu vilissimi

nidoris alicujus, sed tuo proprio; nec animâ pecudis impensâ, sed animâ tuâ.

^u ORIGEN. c. *Cels.* l. iii. s. 34.—οἱ μὲν γὰρ νεῶς καὶ ἀγάλματα κατεσκεύασαν τοῖς κατειλεγμένοις· ἡμεῖς δὲ τὴν διὰ τῶν

And again ; “ We do not honour images, that, as much as in us lies, we may not fall into the suspicion that these images are other Gods ^x. ”

Cæcilius had objected to the Christians that they worshipped a guilty man and the Cross. Minutius Felix, in the person of Octavius, answers, “ Of a truth that man is miserable, all whose hope rests upon a mortal man ; for his whole help is put an end to when the man is dead. The Egyptians indeed choose for themselves a man to worship, they propitiate him only, they consult him on all occasions, they slay victims to him, and he, who to others is a God, to himself is certainly a man, whether he will or no : for he cannot deceive his own conscience, though he cheats another’s. To princes and kings also, not as to great and distinguished men, as would be proper, but basely as to Gods, a false adulation is offered, for to an illustrious man honour with more truth, to the best man love with more acceptance, should be given. So they call upon their deity, they offer up prayers to their images, they implore his genius, that is, his spirit, and it is safer for them to forswear themselves by the genius of Jove, than of their king. Crosses also we neither worship nor pray to. You who consecrate wooden Gods, worship perhaps wooden crosses, as parts of your Gods. For these very ensigns and banners, and

τοιούτων τιμὴν ἀνελόντες ἀπὸ τοῦ
θείου (ὡς ἀρμοζόντων μᾶλλον δαι-
μονίοις, —) τεθήκαμεν τὸν
Ἰησοῦν.—

Οὐ τιμῶμεν δὲ τὰ ἀγάλματα καὶ
διὰ τὸ μὴ τὸ ἔσσαν ἐφ’ ἡμῖν κατα-
πίπτειν εἰς ὑπόληψιν τὴν περὶ τοῦ
εἶναι τὰ ἀγάλματα θεοὺς ἑτέρους.

^x Idem, *ibid.* l. vii. s. 66.

the standards in your camps, what else are they but gilded and emblazoned crosses? Your trophies of victory not only resemble the appearance of a simple cross, but also of a man fixed to it^y.”

“What can be more ridiculous than that man should be a manufacturer of God? Scripture usually calls idols an abomination; hence the statue, that stands in the temple, is called the abomination of desolation; for it says, ‘When ye shall see the abomination of desolation stand in the holy place, (whoso readeth, let him understand);’ for when he led them away from being stupified with awe of sensible objects, he forbade them to make any image whatsoever; and he called this an abomination, in order to withdraw them as far as possible from impiety: for to abominate, is to hate a thing excessively as being impure and unholy. This abomination, therefore, is said in the Scriptures to deserve our hatred and detestation; and such is every idol. ‘And they worshipped that which their own fingers have made; and the mean man boweth down, and the great man humbleth himself^z.’ For as the worship of God raises men on high, so their worship humbles him and brings him down^a.”

^y MINUCH FELICIS. OCTAV. p. 34. *ed Lugd. Bat.* 1652.—*Cruces etiam nec colimus nec oramus—tropæa vestra victricia non tantum simplicis crucis faciem, verum et affixi hominis imitantur.*

^z Isaiah, ii. 8, 9.

^a CHRYSOST. in *Esai.* cap. ii. τί γὰρ ἂν γένοιτο καταγελαστότερον ἄλλο, ἢ ἴταν ἄνθρωπος δημιουργὸς ἢ Θεοῦ;—Ἐπειδὴ γὰρ αὐτοὺς ἀπήγαγε τοῦ πρὸς τὰ αἰσθητὰ ἐπτοῆσθαι, ἀπηγόρευσεν αὐτοῖς πᾶν εἰκόνισμα ποιῆσαι.—

Fourthly and lastly, *Of Reliques, and Invocation of Saints.*

The expression in the creed of pope Pius IV. that the reliques of saints “are to be venerated,” is a cautious one; but, whatever that may mean, the practice of the Romanists has extended and does still extend to adoration and worshipping. The early Christians, as will be seen from the subjoined extracts, shewed the utmost respect to the bodies and to the memories of those who had suffered martyrdom in the cause of Christianity. They carefully collected their remains, and buried them with solemnity and honour, and held their religious assemblies at the places where the bodies were buried. The professed object of this, as well as of their celebrating certain festival or saints’ days, was to shew their love for their departed brethren, and to encourage themselves to the imitation of their virtues and constancy.

The worship of reliques and the invocation of saints are so closely connected, that in order to avoid multiplying of subdivisions, the passages from the Fathers, in both points, may be placed together.

“If, as reason hath taught us, we are to give credit to any one of those who have introduced particular sects, among the Greeks or Barbarians; how much more should we believe in him, who is God over all? and in him who teaches us, that he only is to be worshipped? and to look upon other things, either as if they did not exist, or existing in-

deed, and deserving of honour, but not of worship, and adoration ^b ?”

“ But let us see in what way Celsus, who professes that he knows all things, calumniates the Jews, saying, ‘ that they worship Angels, and follow after witchcraft, in which Moses instructed them.’ For in what part of the writings of Moses he has found the lawgiver enjoining the worship of Angels, let him shew, who professes to know the affairs of Christians and Jews. And how witchcraft is to be followed by those who receive the law of Moses, and have read that commandment ; ‘ ye shall not cleave to enchanters, to be polluted by them ^c ’ ^d .”

In this place Origen clearly puts the worshipping of Angels on the same footing with witchcraft.

In the Declaration of the Church of Smyrna, which is to be found in Eusebius, is the following passage :

“ Not knowing, that neither can we ever leave Christ, who suffered for the salvation of all those, who out of mankind were to be saved, neither can we worship any other. For we adore him as the Son of God ; but we love the Martyrs as we ought to love them, as being the disciples and imitators

^b ORIGEN. *c. Cels.* l. i. c. 11. — πῶς οὐχὶ μᾶλλον τῷ ἐπὶ πᾶσι Θεῷ, καὶ τῷ διδάσκοντι τούτον μόνον δεῖν σέβειν, τὰ δὲ λοιπὰ, ἥτοι ὡς μὴ ὄντα, ἢ ὡς ὄντα μὲν, καὶ τιμῆς ἅξια, οὐ μὲν καὶ προσκυνήσεως καὶ σεβασμοῦ.

^c Levit. xix. 31.

^d ORIGEN. *c. Cels.* l. i. c.

26. p. 344. — Ποῦ γὰρ τῶν γραμμάτων Μωϋσέως εὔρε τὸν νομοθέτην παραδιδόντα σέβειν ἀγγέλους, λεγέτω ὁ ἐπαγγελλόμενος εἰδέναι τὰ Χριστιανῶν καὶ Ἰουδαίων· πῶς δὲ καὶ γοητεία, παρὰ τοῖς παραδεξαμένοις τὸν Μωϋσέως νόμον ἐστίν, ἀνεγνώκοσι καὶ τό· τοῖς ἐπαιδοῖς, κ. τ. λ.

of our Lord, and for the sake of their unshaken affection, to their King and Master^e.”

Augustine, in the preceding chapter to that which is quoted below, had shewn that the heathens worshipped only men who were dead; he now declares “what degree of honour Christians pay to the martyrs.”

“We do not erect temples, nor constitute an order of priests, nor rites nor sacrifices to the martyrs; because not they, but their God, is our God. We honour indeed their memories as the saints of God, who until their death fought for the truth, that true religion might be made known, and false and feigned superstitions overcome, but if any others before them had thought the same, they were silent through fear. But who ever heard the priest of the faithful, standing at the altar that was built even over the holy body of the martyr, in honour, and for the worship of God, say in his prayers, ‘I offer sacrifice unto thee Peter, or Paul, or Cyprian;’ when it is offered in memory of them to God, who made them both men and martyrs, and advanced them to the fellowship of his holy angels unto heavenly honour; that at that festival we might both give thanks to God for their victories, and that we might ourselves, by the renewal of their memories, be encouraged to endeavour after such crowns and glories, calling upon the same God for help. Whatever religious observances therefore are used at the

^e EUSEB. *Hist.* l. iv. c. 15.
p. 171. — τοὺς δὲ μάρτυρας,
ὡς μαθητὰς τοῦ Κυρίου καὶ μιμητὰς,

ἀγαπῶμεν ἀξίως, ἕνεκα εὐνοίας ἀνυ-
περβλήτου τοῦ εἰς τὸν ἴδιον βασιλέα
καὶ διδάσκαλον.

solemnities of martyrs, are ornaments to their memories, not rites or sacrifices to the dead, as unto Gods. And those that bring their banquets thither, which however is not done by the better Christians, and in most countries there is no such custom at all—yet such as do so, when they have laid them down, they pray, and take them away, to eat them or to bestow on those that are in need; they wish that these things may be sanctified to themselves, through the merits of the martyrs, in the name of the martyr's God [†]."

ARTICLE XXIII.

Of Ministering in the Congregation.

"It is not lawful for any man to take upon him the office
 "of public preaching, or ministering the sacraments in the
 "congregation, before he be lawfully called and sent to
 "execute the same: and those we ought to judge lawfully

[†] AUGUST. *de Civit. Dei*, l. viii. c. 27. *De modo honoris, quem Christiani martyribus impendunt.*—Honoramus sane memorias eorum, tanquam sanctorum hominum Dei, qui usque ad mortem corporum suorum pro veritate certârunt —Quis autem audivit aliquando fidelium stantem sacerdotem ad altare etiam super

sanctum corpus martyris ad Dei honorem cultumque constructum, dicere in precibus, *Offero tibi sacrificium, Petre, vel Paule, vel Cypriane*; cum apud eorum memorias offeratur Deo, qui eos et homines et martyres fecit, et sanctis suis angelis cœlesti honore sociavit.

“ called and sent, which be chosen and called to this work
“ by men who have public authority given unto them in
“ the congregation to call and send Ministers into the
“ Lord’s vineyard.

This Article asserts two particulars; first, that it is unlawful for any person to assume to himself the authority of performing any public act of an ecclesiastical Minister, without Orders, or a regular and lawful appointment. The second part defines, in very general terms, what constitutes a lawful call or appointment.

It will be seen that the early Fathers constantly speak of those who ministered having received a regular commission to do so. Unless the Waldenses in the twelfth century may be considered an exception, it was not until the period of the Reformation, that the right of ministering in the congregation without the authority of Bishops was pretended to by any. But then, in consequence of the Bishops, in some countries abroad, refusing to ordain those who were separating from the Roman Church, they had resort to ordination by Elders. Socinus was one of the first to insist that any assembly of Christians had a right to form themselves into a separate Church, and that any person might minister by general consent of the members. This notion has been adopted by various classes of dissenters. Against such, therefore, it may be considered that this Article is directed.

On the second particular, as to what constitutes a lawful call or appointment, Bishop Burnet says, “ The Article does not resolve this into any par-

ticular constitution, but leaves the matter open and at large, for such accidents as had happened, and such as still might happen. They who drew it had the state of the several Churches before their eyes, that had been differently reformed; and although their own had been less forced to go out of the beaten path than any other, yet they knew that all things among themselves had not gone according to those rules that ought to be sacred in regular times."

I have inserted the above from Bishop Burnet as the concession of a very able divine of our Church; but though the Article does not here define what constitutes a lawful call and appointment to the ministry, yet the Church of England ever upheld the necessity of an Apostolical succession, and Episcopal ordination. For, to use the expressions introductory to our ordination services, "it is evident unto all men diligently reading the Holy Scripture and ancient authors, that from the Apostles' time there have been these orders of ministers in Christ's Church, Bishops, Priests, and Deacons, which offices were evermore had in such reverend estimation, that no man might presume to execute any of them, except he were first called, tried, examined, and known to have such qualities as are requisite for the same; and also by public prayer, with imposition of hands by lawful authority. And therefore, to the intent that these orders may be continued, and reverently used and esteemed, in the United Church of England and Ireland, no man shall be accounted or taken to be a lawful

Bishop, Priest, or Deacon, in the United Church of England and Ireland, or suffered to execute any of the said functions, except he be called, tried, examined, and admitted thereunto, according to the form hereafter following, or hath had formerly Episcopal consecration or ordination ^a.”

From the following extracts it will be seen, that not only was a regular appointment to the ministry deemed indispensably necessary in the primitive Churches, but that the several orders and degrees now maintained amongst us were considered by them to be according to the Apostolic rule.

“Wherefore it becomes you also, not to use your bishop too familiarly on account of his youth; but to yield all reverence to him, according to the power of God the Father; as also I perceive that your holy presbytery do, not regarding his, to all appearance, youthful ordination; but as prudent in God, submitting to him, or rather not to him, but to the Father of Jesus Christ, the bishop of us all. It behoves you, therefore, in honour of him who wills it, to obey your bishop, without any hypocrisy. Because it is not that any one deceives the bishop, whom he sees, but affronts Him that is invisible. For whatsoever of this kind is done, the account is not with man but with God, who knows the secrets of our hearts.

“It is therefore fitting not only to be called Christians, but to be so: as some call, indeed, their bishop by that name, but do all things without

^a Preface to the Ordination Services.

him. But such do not seem to me to have a good conscience, seeing they are not firmly gathered together according to the commandment^b.”

And again in the sixth section the several orders of Bishops, Priests, and Deacons, are distinctly mentioned, and their several degrees pointed out :

“ Forasmuch, therefore, as I have, in the persons before mentioned, seen all of you in faith and charity, I exhort you that you study to do all things in a divine concord, your bishop presiding in the place of God, your presbyters in the place of the council of the Apostles, and your deacons, most dear to me, being entrusted with the ministry of Jesus Christ, who, before all ages, was with the Father, and appeared in the end^c.”

“ It is fitting that you should by all means glorify Jesus Christ, who hath glorified you ; that by a uniform obedience, ‘ ye may be perfectly joined together in the same mind, and in the same judgment ; and may all speak the same things concerning every thing^d :’ that being subject to your bishop and the presbyters, ye may be wholly sanctified^e.”

^b *IGNAT. ad Magnes. s. 3, 4.*
Καὶ ὑμῖν δὲ πρέπει μὴ συγχρᾶσθαι τῇ ἡλικίᾳ τοῦ Ἐπισκόπου, ἀλλὰ κατὰ δύναμιν Θεοῦ Πατρὸς πᾶσαν ἐντροπήν αὐτῷ ἀπονέμειν, καθὼς ἔγνω καὶ τοὺς ἁγίους πρεσβυτέρους, οὐ προσηληφόμενος τὴν φαινομένην νεωτερικὴν τάξιν, ἀλλ’ ὡς φρονίμους ἐν Θεῷ συγχωροῦντας αὐτῷ· οὐκ αὐτῷ δὲ, ἀλλὰ τῷ Πατρὶ Ἰησοῦ Χριστοῦ τῷ πάντων Ἐπισκόπῳ.—Πρέπει οὖν ἔστιν μὴ μόνον καλιῖσθαι Χριστιανούς ἀλλὰ καὶ εἶναι ὥσπερ καὶ τινες Ἐπίσκοπον μὲν καλοῦσιν, χωρὶς δὲ αὐτοῦ πάντα πρᾶσσουσιν· οἱ τοιοῦτοι

δὲ οὐκ εὐσυνείδητοί μοι εἶναι φαίνονται—

^c *Idem, ibid. s. 6.*—προκαθημένου τοῦ Ἐπισκόπου εἰς τόπον Θεοῦ, καὶ τῶν πρεσβυτέρων εἰς τόπον συνεδρίου τῶν Ἀποστόλων, καὶ τῶν διακόνων, τῶν ἐμοὶ γλυκυτάτων, πεπιστευμένων διακονίαν Ἰησοῦ Χριστοῦ—

^d *1 Cor. i. 10.*

^e *IGNAT. ad Ephes. s. 2.*—ἵνα ἐπιτασσόμενοι τῷ Ἐπισκόπῳ, καὶ τῷ πρεσβυτέρῳ, κατὰ πάντα ἡτε ἡγιασμένοι.

And again in the third section, “ Forasmuch as charity suffers me not to be silent respecting you, I have therefore first taken upon me to exhort you, that ye would run together according to the will of God. For even Jesus Christ, our inseparable life, is the will of the Father, as the bishops appointed, unto the utmost bounds of the earth, are by the will of Jesus Christ.

“ Therefore it becomes you to run together according to the will of your bishop, as also ye do. For your famous presbytery, worthy of God, is so fitted to the bishop, as the strings are to the harp. Therefore in your concord and agreeing charity Christ is sung; and ye are individually the chorus, that so being all consonant in the sameness of mind, and taking up the song of God, ye may in unity with one voice, sing to the Father by Jesus Christ; to the end that he may both hear you, and perceive by the things that ye do, that ye are members of his Son. Wherefore it is profitable for you to live in an unblameable unity, that so ye may always have a fellowship with God^f.”

“ He that is within the altar is pure; but he that is without, that is, that does any thing without the bishop and presbyters, and deacons, is not pure in his conscience^g.”

And in his Epistle to the Church of Smyrna, he

^f Idem, *ibid.* s. 3, 4.—ὡς καὶ οἱ Ἐπίσκοποι οἱ κατὰ τὰ πέρατα ὀρισθέντες ἐν Ἰησοῦ Χριστοῦ γνώμῃ εἰσὶν. “Ὅθεν πρέπει ὑμῖν συντρέχειν τῷ τοῦ Ἐπισκόπου γνώμῃ, ὑπὲρ καὶ ποιεῖτε.—

^g Idem, *ad Trall.* s. 7. — ὁ χωρὶς Ἐπισκόπου καὶ πρεσβυτερίων καὶ διακόνων πράσων τι, οὗτος οὐ καθαρὸς ἐστὶν τῇ συνειδήσει.

shews that the presbyters derived their authority from the bishop :

“ It is not lawful either to baptize or celebrate the eucharist without the bishop ; but that which he allows is well-pleasing to God ^h. ” The expression, “ without the bishop,” clearly means, without the consent or authority of the bishop.

“ Since then these things are manifest unto us, it will behove us, looking into the depths of the divine knowledge, to do all things in order, whatsoever the Lord has commanded us to do. He has commanded us to perform our offerings and services at their appointed seasons ; and that they be not done rashly or disorderly, but at certain determinate times and hours. And where and by what persons he will have them performed, he has ordained by his supreme will : that so all things being piously done unto all well-pleasing, they may be acceptable unto his will. They therefore who make their offerings at the appointed seasons are accepted and blessed ; because obeying the commandment of the Lord, they do not err. For to the Chief Priest are given his proper services, and to the Priests their proper place is appointed, and to the Levites appertain their proper ministries, and the layman is confined within the bounds appointed to laymen.”

Clemens, having made further allusions to the services of the Jewish priests, continues the same subject in the forty-second section.

“ The Apostles have preached to us from our

^h Idem, *ad Smyrn.* s. 8. που, οὔτε βαπτίζειν, οὔτε ἀγάπην
Οὐκ ἐξόν ἐστιν χωρὶς τοῦ Ἐπισκό- ποιεῖν.—

Lord Jesus Christ, Jesus Christ from God ; Christ therefore was sent by God, and the Apostles by Christ. So both were orderly sent according to the will of God. For having received their command, and being fully assured by the resurrection of our Lord Jesus Christ, and being confirmed in faith by the Word of God, with the fulness of the Holy Spirit, they went abroad publishing that the kingdom of God was at hand. Preaching therefore through countries and cities, they appointed their first-fruits, having proved them by the Spirit, to be bishops and deacons of such as should afterwards believe. Nor was this any new thing, for in times long past it was written concerning bishops and deacons. For thus saith the Scripture in a certain place, ‘ I will appoint their overseers in righteousness, and their ministers in faith ^{i' k.}”

He alludes in the next section to the mode in which Moses put a stop to the emulation that arose among the twelve tribes concerning the priesthood, and then continues :

“ So likewise our Apostles knew by our Lord Jesus Christ, that there should be contentions on account of the Episcopacy. For this cause therefore, having received a perfect foreknowledge, they appointed the above-mentioned persons, and besides gave directions for the future, how, when they

ⁱ Isaiah, lx. 17.

^k CLEM. ROM. *ad Corinth.*
s. 40, 42. — Ποῦ τε καὶ διὰ
τινων ἐπιτελεῖσθαι θέλει, αὐτὸς ὥρισεν
τῇ ὑπερτάτῃ αὐτοῦ βουλήσει· ἵν' ὁσίως
πάντα γινόμενα ἰν' εὐδοκήσῃ, εὐπρόσ-

δεκτα εἶη, τῷ θελήματι αὐτοῦ——
Κατὰ χώρας οὖν καὶ πόλεις κηρύσ-
σοντες, καθίστανον τὰς ἀπαρχὰς
αὐτῶν, δοκιμάσαντες τῷ πνεύματι,
εἰς Ἐπισκόπους καὶ διακόνους τῶν
μελλόντων πιστεύειν.——

should die, other approved men should succeed to their ministry. Wherefore we do not think that those may be justly thrown out of their ministry, who were either appointed by them, or afterwards by other eminent men, with the approval of the whole Church; and who have with all lowliness ministered to the flock of Christ peaceably, and without self interest, and have for a long time received good witness from all. For it will be no small sin in us, if we cast off those from their bishopric, who without blame and holily fulfil the duties of it. Blessed are those presbyters who, having finished their course before these times, have obtained a fruitful and perfect dissolution; for they have no fear, lest any one should remove them from the place now appointed for them. But we see how you have put out some, who lived respectably among you, from the ministry, which by their innocence they had adorned¹."

Irenæus gives a catalogue of the bishops who successively governed the see of Rome from the Apostles to his own time, and says :

"The blessed Apostles founding and setting in order the Church, gave the bishopric to Linus, for the government of the Church^m."

Clemens Alexandrinus, speaking of St. John, says, "When, after the death of the tyrant, he had

¹ Idem, *ibid.* s. 44. Διὰ τὰς τὴν οὖν τὴν αἰτίαν πρόγνωσιν εἰληφότες τελείαν, κατέστησαν τοὺς προειρημένους, καὶ μετὰ τὸ ἐπινομήν δεδώκασιν ὅπως ἐὰν κοιμηθῶσιν, διαδέξωνται ἕτεροι δεδοκιμασμένοι ἄνδρες, τὴν λειτουργίαν αὐτῶν.—

^m IRENÆI, l. iii. c. iii. s. 3. Θεμελιώσαντες οὖν καὶ οἰκοδομήσαντες οἱ μακάριοι Ἀπόστολοι τὴν ἐκκλησίαν, Λίνῳ τὴν τῆς ἐπισκοπῆς λειτουργίαν ἐνεχείρισαν.

returned from the isle of Patmos, to Ephesus; being often invited, he went to visit the neighbouring regions, in some places to ordain bishops, in others to set in order whole Churches, in others to set apart such men for the clergy, as were signified to him by the Holy Ghost ⁿ.”

Again he mentions the three orders; “There are here in the Church the different degrees or progressions of bishops, presbyters, and deacons, in imitation, I think, of the angelical glory ^o.”

Tertullian accuses the heretics of entirely neglecting the Church discipline, and says, “One man is a bishop to day, another to-morrow; he is a deacon to day, who to-morrow will be a reader; he is a presbyter to day, who to-morrow will be a layman; for they impose the offices of the priesthood even upon the laymen ^p.”

“The right of baptizing belongs to the chief priest, who is the bishop;—and after him, to presbyters and deacons, yet not without the authority of the bishop, for the honour of the Church, in the preservation of which consists the Church’s peace ^q.”

ⁿ CLEM. ALEX. *Quis Dives salvetur*. c. 42. p. 959. —ὅπου μὲν ἐπισκόπους καταστήσων, ὅπου δὲ ὅλας ἐκκλησίας ἀρμόσων, ὅπου δὲ κλήρον, ἓνα γέ τινα κληρώσων ἐπὶ τοῦ πνεύματος σημαينوμένων.

^o Idem. *Strom.* l. vi. c. 13. Ἐπεὶ καὶ αἱ ἐνταῦθα κατὰ τὴν Ἐκκλησίαν προκοπαί, ἐπισκόπων, πρεσβυτέρων, διακόνων, μμήματα, οἶμαι, Ἀγγελικῆς δόξης.

^p TERTULL. *de Præscript. Hæret.* c. 41. Alius hodie

Episcopus, cras alius: hodie diaconus, qui cras lector; hodie presbyter, qui cras lacijs. Nam et laicis sacerdotalia munera injungunt.

^q TERTULL. *de Bapt.* c. 17. Dandi quidem habet jus summus sacerdos, qui est Episcopus. Dehinc presbyteri et diaconi, non tamen sine Episcopi auctoritate, propter Ecclesiæ honorem. Quo salvo, salva pax est.

In another place he mentions this distinction of order to have been settled by the Apostles :

“ The order of bishops, when it is traced up to its original, will be found to have St. John for one of its authors ^r. ”

To these passages from Tertullian might be added another very forcible one, in which he insists on the necessity of maintaining the Apostolical succession. As that passage alluded to will be found under the thirty-seventh Article, it need not be given here

In the primitive Churches the bishops alone had power to ordain the inferior clergy, and that power they never committed to the presbyters. By the fourth Council of Carthage the presbyters were allowed to assist, but not to ordain or to pronounce the benediction :

“ When a presbyter is being ordained, and the bishop is blessing him, and laying his hand upon his head, all the presbyters also, who are present, may lay their hand upon his head near the hand of the bishop ^s. ”

“ The order of bishops begets fathers to the Church, but the order of presbyters not being able to do this, begets sons by the regeneration of baptism ^t. ”

^r Idem, *adv. Marcion*, l. iv. c. 5. Ordo Episcoporum ad originem recensens, in Johannem stabit auctorem.

^s *Conc. Carthag.* 4. *can.* 3. Presbyter eum ordinatur, Episcopo cum benedicente, et manum super caput ejus tenente, etiam omnes presbyteri, qui

præsentes sunt, manus suas juxta manum Episcopi super caput illius teneant.

^t EPIPHAN. *Hæres.* l. iii. *Hær.* 75. s. 4. Πατέρας γὰρ γεννᾷ τῇ Ἐκκλησίᾳ ἡ δὲ πατέρας μὴ δυνάμεν γεννᾶν, διὰ τῆς τοῦ λουτροῦ παλιγγενεσίας τέκνα γεννᾷ τῇ Ἐκκλησίᾳ.

Hence bishops derived their title of “father of fathers,” an honour by no means peculiar of the bishop of Rome.

And Chrysostom says: “Bishops and presbyters differ not much from one another; for presbyters receive the office of preaching, and govern the Church: and the same qualifications that the Apostle requires in Bishops, are required in presbyters also; for Bishops are superior to them only in the power of ordination, and in this thing only seem to be superior to presbyters^u.”

And Jerome asks: What does a Bishop more than a presbyter, setting aside the business of ordination^x?”

It was at the same time an acknowledged principle of the primitive Churches, that all the inferior clergy, presbyters, and deacons, derived their authority from their Bishops. Thus Jerome says:

“Thence it comes, that neither presbyter nor deacon has a right to baptize without the authority of the Bishop^y.” And in the same work he says, “That is not a Church, which has not priests^z.”

^u CHRYSOST. in 1 Tim. c. 3. v. 8. Hom. xi. init. Ὁυ πολὺ μέσον αὐτῶν καὶ τῶν ἐπισκόπων· καὶ γὰρ καὶ αὐτοὶ διδασκαλίαν εἰσὶν ἀναδεεγμένοι, καὶ προστασίαν τῆς ἐκκλησίας, καὶ ἃ περὶ ἐπισκόπων εἶπε, ταῦτα καὶ πρεσβυτέροις ἀρμόττει· τῇ γὰρ χειροτονίᾳ μόνῃ ὑπερβήκασιν, καὶ τοῦτῃ μόνον ἑοικοῦσιν πλεονεκτεῖν τοῖς πρεσβυτέροις.

^x Hieron. Ep. 85. ad.

Evagr. Quid enim facit, exceptâ ordinatione, Episcopus, quod presbyter non facit?

^y Idem, Dial. c. Lucifer. p. 139. Inde venit, ut sine jussione Episcopi, neque Presbyter, neque diaconus, jus habeant baptizandi.

^z Idem, ibid. p. 145. Ecclesia non est, quæ non habet sacerdotes.

ARTICLE XXIV.

*Of speaking in the Congregation in such a Tongue
as the people understandeth.*

“It is a thing plainly repugnant to the Word of God,
“and the custom of the Primitive Church, to have public
“prayer in the Church, or to minister the sacraments, in
“a tongue not understood of the people.”

In the primitive Church, the liturgies used in Europe were either Greek or Latin, the former in the Eastern, the latter in the Western Church. These were at that time the two prevailing languages. It is unnecessary to trace the history of the adoption of liturgies in other languages, but it will be sufficient to shew that the public services were conducted in a language, which the people could understand.

The Council of Trent^a pronounces an anathema on those who say, that Mass ought to be celebrated in the vulgar tongue; but orders the Pastors to make frequent explanations of what is said at Mass. The result is, that with the Romanists it is not improper for those who understand Latin, to understand the services, but it is improper for

^a Sess. 22. cap. 8. and Canon 9.

those who do not understand Latin, to know what they are doing ; unless they may pretend that that language, because it was *not* used by the Apostles, was held sacred by them.

“ On the day which is called Sunday, there is an assembly of all those who live either in cities, or in the country ; and the books of the Prophets, or the writings of the Apostles, are there read, as long as time will permit. When the reader has done, he who presides in the assembly makes a discourse, in which he admonishes and exhorts us to imitate and practise the fine things we have heard. Then we all rise up with one consent, and send forth our prayers to God^b. ”

It is not possible to read the following passage from Tertullian without coming to the conclusion, that it was deemed necessary to perform the public services of the Church in a language understood by the people.

“ We assemble ourselves together, that being formed into an army, if I may so speak, we may force God with our prayers ; and this violence is acceptable to God. We pray also for the emperors, for their ministers, and for the powers of this world, for peace, and for the retarding the end of the world. We meet also to read the Holy Scriptures, according as the emergency of our present wants requires, either to instruct or remind us of our duties.—We assuredly nourish our faith by these sacred oracles, we raise our hope, we

^b JUSTIN. *Apol.* l. c. 67.—ἔπειτα ἀνιστάμεθα κοινῇ πάντες, καὶ εὐχὰς πέμπομεν.

strengthen our confidence, at all events we enforce discipline by the constant repetition of the divine commandments: in the same place also exhortations, reproofs, and divine censures are given. And our judgments are given with great weight, as by those who are assured that they are under the eye of God^c."

But Origen affords us the most express testimony on this point: "The Greeks in the Greek language, the Romans in the Roman language, and so every one prays in his own tongue, and praises God according to his power; and the Lord of all tongues hears them praying with all their several tongues^d."

"When we stand up to pray, my dearly beloved brethren, we ought to watch, and attend to our prayers with our whole heart. All carnal and worldly thoughts should be discarded, and the mind should be solely intent upon what it prays for. And therefore the Priest, before the prayer, doth by a preface prepare the minds of the brethren, saying, 'Lift up your hearts;' that while the people answer 'We lift them up unto the Lord' they may be admonished that they ought to think of nothing else but the Lord. Our breast should be then shut against the adversary, and open to God only; neither should God's enemy be suffered to come

^c TERTULL. *Apol.* c. 39—
Coimus in cœtum et congregationem, ut ad Deum quasi manu factâ, precationibus ambiamus; hæc vis Deo grata est, etc.

^d ORIGEN. *c. Cels.* l. viii. s. 37.—Οἱ μὲν Ἕλληνες Ἑλληνικαῖς, οἱ δὲ Ῥωμαῖοι Ῥωμαϊκαῖς, καὶ οὕτως ἕκαστος κατὰ τὴν ἑαυτοῦ διάλεκτον εὐχεται τῷ Θεῷ——

near it in the time of prayer. For he frequently steals upon us, and gets admission into us, and by his subtle deceits diverts our prayers from God; so that we have one thing in our heart, and another in our mouth: whereas we ought to pray to the Lord, not only with the sound of the voice, but with the sincere intenseness of the mind and spirit^e."

ARTICLE XXV.

Of the Sacraments.

"SACRAMENTS ordained of Christ, be not only badges or tokens of Christian men's profession; but rather, they be certain sure witnesses, and effectual signs of grace, and God's good will towards us, by the which he doth work invisibly in us, and doth not only quicken, but also strengthen and confirm our Faith in Him.

"There are two Sacraments ordained of Christ our Lord in the Gospel, that is to say, Baptism and the Supper of the Lord.

"Those five commonly called Sacraments, that is to say, Confirmation, Penance, Orders, Matrimony, and Extreme Unction, are not to be counted for Sacraments of the Gospel, being such as have grown, partly of the

^e CYPRIAN. *de Oratione Dominica*, s. 22.—Quando autem stamus ad orationem, patres dilectissimi, vigilare et incumbere ad preces toto corde debemus.—

“ corrupt following of the Apostles, partly are states of
“ life allowed in the Scriptures : but yet have not like na-
“ ture of Sacraments with Baptism, and the Lord’s
“ Supper, for that they have not any visible sign or cere-
“ mony ordained of God.

“ The Sacraments were not ordained of Christ to be
“ gazed upon, or to be carried about ; but that we should
“ duly use them. And in such only as worthily receive
“ the same, they have a wholesome effect or operation ;
“ but they that receive them unworthily, purchase to
“ themselves damnation, as St. Paul saith.”

This Article treats of Sacraments in general, and begins by defining what a Sacrament is :—it is not only a “ badge or token of Christian men’s profession ;”—this was inserted in opposition to those sectaries, who so lowered the use of the sacraments, as to consider them nothing more than outward signs of a Christian’s profession. That the early Fathers held no such opinion will be abundantly seen from the extracts adduced under the following Articles, so that this part of the Article will not require separate proof.

The rest of the Article was framed solely against the Romanists, and therefore it will be necessary to see whether we differ from them in our general definition of a sacrament. This will be the more requisite, because the Fathers very commonly use the word “ Sacrament ” in a larger and more varied sense than the Church of England does, as applying to almost all religious ceremonies, and sometimes to doctrines. If, therefore, the Church of Rome uses it in this larger sense, it might be, that

as regards the most of those five, which we reject, we differ with them only in the meaning of the word.

The Article in the creed of pope Pius IV., which relates to this matter, will be given presently, in the mean time the definition given in our Church Catechism may be compared with one given by Dr. Challoner^a, in a work which is in the hands of the generality of the Romanists in this country and Ireland.

In our Church Catechism the word "Sacrament" is described to mean ; - "an outward and visible sign of an inward and spiritual grace, given unto us, ordained by Christ himself, as a means whereby we receive the same, and a pledge to assure us thereof." By Dr. Challoner^b, "an outward sign or ceremony of Christ's institution, by which grace is given to the soul of the worthy receiver." Again he says, "the necessary conditions for a thing to be a sacrament are these three: First, It must be a sacred sign, and consequently, as to the outward performance, it must be visible or sensible. Secondly, This sacred sign must have annexed unto it a power of communicating grace to the soul. Thirdly, This must be by virtue of the ordinance or institution of Christ." Again, in the Trent Cathecism, a sacrament is defined, "a thing subject to sense, which by God's appointment has virtue both to signify, and to work holiness and righteousness."

^a *The Catholic Christian instructed in the Sacraments, etc.*
11th ed. Dublin, 1803.

^b Cap. ii.

These definitions sufficiently agree with our own to decide the present question, viz. ; whether there are two only, or seven sacraments. We differ with the Romanists as to the *necessary* effect of the sacraments, but this difference need not be further noticed at present.

Since then there is, thus far, no point of difference between our Church and the Roman, it will not be necessary to give passages from the Fathers containing general definitions of the word Sacrament, though that will sufficiently appear when the Sacraments of Baptism and the Lord's Supper are separately treated of.

Our Article in the next place asserts, that "there are two Sacraments ordained of Christ, viz. ; Baptism and the Supper of the Lord." Neither will this require separate proof, for the Romanists admit these two.

At length we arrive at the point of difference ; we reject five, which they receive. The 14th Article of the creed of pope Pius IV. is as follows : " I profess also, that there are truly and properly seven sacraments of the new law, instituted by Jesus Christ our Lord, and for the salvation of mankind, (though all are not necessary for every one) viz. ; baptism, confirmation, eucharist, penance, extreme unction, order, and matrimony ; and that they confer grace ; and of these baptism, confirmation, and orders, cannot be re-iterated without sacrilege."

First, then, of *Confirmation*.

We have seen in the twenty-third Article that the inferior clergy received their power of baptizing from their Bishops; it was thought necessary, wherever circumstances did not render it impossible, that the Bishop should *confirm* what the inferior ministers had done under his authority. Hence it was customary for persons to be presented to the Bishop, if he was present, immediately after the ceremony of baptism was ended, “in order to receive his benediction, which was a solemn prayer for the descent of the Holy Ghost, on such as were baptized: and to this prayer there was joined the ceremony of a second unction, and imposition of hands, and the sign of the cross^c.” As the Bishop could not always be present, the rite of confirmation was deferred until the Bishop was able to go in person, which in some Churches he was compelled to do once in every year.

The fifth and sixth sections of Tertullian’s treatise on Baptism, will be found under the twenty-seventh Article; in the seventh section he proceeds, “As soon as we are come out of the water, we are anointed with the blessed unction according to the ancient discipline, whereby they were accustomed to be anointed with oil from the horn, unto the priesthood.—After that follows imposition of hands, calling down and invoking the Holy Spirit by the benediction^d.”

^c See BINGHAM’s *Antiquities*,
B. xii. c. 1.

^d TERTULL. *de Bapt.* s. 7,
8. Exinde egressi de lavacro

Cyprian, in giving an account of the proceedings of an African Council in which the question had been proposed, whether those who had been baptized by heretics, should be re-baptized, or whether confirmation alone was sufficient, says, "Those who have been baptized out of the Church, and have been polluted by the stain of profane water, when they come to us and the Church, which is one, must be baptized, because it is to little purpose to lay hands on them that they may receive the Holy Ghost, unless they receive also the baptism of the Church. For then at length they may be fully sanctified, and become the sons of God, if they have obtained both sacraments^e."

In the following letter, which is on the same subject, he mentions those who had been baptized by Philip the deacon^f, and continues, "Therefore because they had obtained a lawful and Ecclesiastical baptism, there was no need that they should be baptized any more; but that only, which was wanting, was done by Peter and John, so that by prayers made on their behalf, and by the imposition of hands, the Holy Ghost might be invoked and poured out upon them: which is now also observed by us, that those who are baptized in the Church, are presented to the governors of the

perungimur benedictâ unctione
—Dehinc manus imponitur,
per benedictionem advocans et
invitans Spiritum Sanctum.

^e CYPRIAN. *Ep.* lxxii. *ad*
Stephanum, s. 1. —Eo quod
parum sit eis manum imponere

ad accipiendum Spiritum Sanc-
tum, nisi accipiant et Ecclesiæ
baptismum. Tunc enim de-
mum plenè sanctificari, et esse
filii Dei possunt, si sacramento
utroque nascantur.

^f Acts, viii.

Church, that by our prayer and imposition of hands they may receive the Holy Ghost^g."

In the first of these two passages Cyprian uses the expression "both sacraments," but it is unnecessary in this place to prove that he does not use the word in the confined sense which we, with the Roman Church, give it; but that he is speaking only of two rites which were necessary to complete men's sanctification.

Jerome says; "But if you object, why does one who is baptized in the Church, by the imposition of the hand of the Bishop only, receive the Holy Ghost, which we assert is given in true baptism? learn that this observance is derived from that authority, viz. that the Holy Ghost descended after the ascent of our Lord. Yet in many places we find that was done rather for the honour of the chief priesthood, than for any absolute necessity of the thing. Otherwise if the Holy Spirit is poured down only by means of the prayer of the Bishop, those men are in a deplorable condition, who were baptized in villages and castles, or other remote places, by presbyters and deacons, and who died before the Bishop came to visit them."

^g Idem, *Ep.* lxxiii. *ad Jubaianum*. s. 3.—Quod nunc quoque apud nos geritur, ut qui in Ecclesiâ baptizantur, præpositis Ecclesiæ offerantur, et per nostram orationem ac manus impositionem Spiritum Sanctum consequantur.

^h *HIERON. c. Lucifer. cap.*

4.—Alioquin si Episcopi tantum imprecatione Spiritus Sanctus defluit, lugendi sunt qui in villulis, aut in castellis, aut in remotioribus locis per presbyteros et diaconos baptizati, ante dormierunt quam ab Episcopis inviserentur.

The above extracts, on the one hand, suffice to shew that confirmation is not a sacrament, and, on the other, to vindicate our Church in retaining it as an Apostolic and important rite.

Secondly, of *Penance*.

It is not possible to treat this subject properly in the brief space of a few pages; the reader therefore who wishes to examine fully into the practice and doctrine of the primitive Churches in this particular, must consult Bingham's *Antiquities*. In this place it must suffice briefly to state the Romish doctrine, and to point out its inconsistencies with the primitive doctrine.

Our thirty-third Article speaks of Penance as a matter of Church discipline, but this Article denies it to be a sacrament; when we come to that Article, it will be seen that ours agrees with the primitive Church in making Penance a matter of Church discipline.

The Romanists make this sacrament of theirs to consist of four requisites, contrition, confession, and satisfaction on the part of the penitent, and absolution on the part of the minister: they make "the outward and visible sign" to consist of the sinner's confession, and the form of absolution pronounced by the priest. This confession must be auricular; if therefore it be shewn that the primitive Churches did not require auricular confession to be made to the minister, it must follow that they did not consider the Penance of the Romish Church to be a sacrament, inasmuch as they omitted that

which the Romanists consider essential to that sacrament, viz. “the outward and visible sign.” It must be admitted that this is rather a technical way of meeting the question, but the necessity of being brief must excuse this method.

Suicerⁱ remarks, that neither Justin Martyr, Clemens Alexandrinus, Tertullian, nor Eusebius, say a word about auricular confession, though all, from the subjects which they handled, would have been likely to mention it had it been practised in their times.

Again he remarks, that those texts of Scripture, which the Romanists cite in support of auricular confessions, were not explained by any of the Fathers in terms to warrant such a conclusion.

To the authorities to be found in Suicer, and a reference to which must in this place suffice, two or three passages which are to be found in Bingham may be added :

Basil says ; “ I do not make confession with my lips, to appear to the world ; but inwardly in my heart where no eye sees ; I declare my groanings unto Thee alone, who seest in secret ; I roar within myself, for I need not many words to make confession ; the groanings of my heart are sufficient for confession, and the lamentations, which are sent up to Thee, my God, from the bottom of my soul^k. ”

ⁱ Verbo, Ἐξομολόγησις.

^k BASIL. in Ps. xxxvii. s. 4.
Οὐ γὰρ ἵνα τοῖς πολλοῖς φανερὸς γέ-

νωμαι, τοῖς χείλεσιν ἐξομολογοῦμαι.

“Tears wash away sin, which men are ashamed to confess with their voice. Weeping provides at once both for pardon and bashfulness : tears speak our faults without horror ; tears confess our crimes without any offence to modesty or shamefacedness¹.”

And Chrysostom says ; “ For this reason I exhort, and entreat, and beseech you to make your confession continually unto God. For I do not bring thee into the theatre of thy fellow-servants, nor compel thee to reveal thy sins unto men ; unfold thy conscience before God, and shew him thy wounds, and ask the cure of him : shew them to Him who will not reproach, but heal thee. For although thou art silent, he knows all. Speak therefore, that thou mayest be a gainer. Speak, that having put off thy sins in this world, thou mayest go pure into the next, and avoid that intolerable publication, which will otherwise be made hereafter^m.”

Augustine is plain enough, “ What have I to do with men, that they should hear my confessions, as if they could heal all my diseasesⁿ.”

Thirdly, of Orders.

It is unnecessary in this place to vindicate the

¹ AMBROS. l. x. in *Luc.* xxii. Lavant lacrymæ delictum quod pudor est voce confiteri.—

^m CHRYSOST. *Hom.* v. de *Incomprehensibili Dei Naturâ*, p. fin. — οὐδὲ γὰρ εἰς θέατρον σε ἄγω τῶν συνδούλων τῶν σῶν,

οὐδὲ ἐκκαλεῖσθαι τοῖς ἀνθρώποις ἀναγκάζω τὰ ἁμαρτήματα.—

ⁿ AUGUST. *Confess.* l. x. c. 3. Quid mihi ergo est cum hominibus, ut audiant confessiones meas, quasi ipsi sanaturi sint omnes languores meos ?

form in which holy orders are conferred in the Church of England. We agree with the Church of Rome in the necessity of prayer and imposition of hands, which they consider to constitute the outward and visible sign of a sacrament. We admit also, with them, the divine institution of an ordained ministry. We differ from them, in not calling Orders a sacrament. If prayer and imposition of hands do not make Confirmation to be a sacrament, neither can they make Orders to be such. The further consideration of this subject therefore may be deferred to the thirty-sixth Article.

Little more need be said of the Romish sacrament of Matrimony, which is the fourth rejected by this Article. Where is the "outward sign of Christ's institution?" It is itself, as they confess, a sign of something else, that is "of the mystical union betwixt Christ and his Church."

When the Montanists and other rigid sectarians in the second and following centuries of the Christian era, altogether objected to the marriage state, and pronounced that those who were married could have no hope of heaven, the catholic Christians, if they had received matrimony as a sacrament, would not in their answers to them, have contented themselves with the defence of that state as allowed by God for wise and holy purposes; but must have vindicated it as the institution of Christ.

Clemens of Alexandria speaks very lightly of matrimony, if it be a sacrament, when he says: "Marriage is the first lawful coming together of a

man and woman, for the begetting of legitimate children^o.”

And again, “They who, through hatred of the flesh, ungratefully desire to be freed from the marriage union, and from the participation of proper meats, are ignorant and impious, being pretenders to an unreasonable abstinence^p.”

And Gregory Naziangen, says, “Marriage is good; for it produces more who are well-pleasing unto God^q.”

To these may be added the following from Chrysostom; “Marriage is no impediment to virtue, otherwise it would have been an hindrance to Job; but this bond hindered not the righteous man from running in a straight course, so that some in vain pretend to find fault with it^r.”

Lastly, of *Extreme Unction*.

This sacrament of the Church of Rome, is avowedly grounded on two particular texts of Scripture, Mark, vi. 13., and James, v. 14.; they say it remits such sins as are venial, it heals the soul of its infirmity and weakness, helps to remove some part of the debt of punishment due to past

^o CLEM. ALEX. *Strom.* l. ii. c. 23. Γάμος μὲν οὖν ἐστὶ σύνοδος ἀνδρὸς καὶ γυναικὸς ἢ πρώτη κατὰ νόμον, ἐπὶ γνησίων τέκνων σπορά.

^p Idem, *ibid.* l. iii. c. 7. Οἱ δὲ διὰ τὸ μῖσος τὸ πρὸς τὴν σάρκα, τῆς κατὰ γάμον συναλλαγῆς, καὶ τῆς τῶν καθηκόντων βρωμάτων μεταλήψεως; ἀχαρίστως ἀπαλλάττεσθαι ποθοῦντες, ἀμαθεῖς τε καὶ ἄθεοι, ἀλόγως ἐγκρατεῦμενοι.

^q GREG. NAZ. *Orat.* xxxi. p. 502. Καλὸς ὁ γάμος· πλείονας γὰρ εἰσάγει τοὺς εὐαρεστοῦντας τῇ Θεῷ.

^r CHRYSOST. *in Cat. in Job.* c. i. p. 2. Οὐδὲν ὁ γάμος ἐμπόδιον πρὸς ἀρετὴν, ἢ γὰρ ἂν καὶ τῷ Ἰὸβ ἐγένετο κώλυμα· ἀλλὰ μὴν ὁ δεσμός οὗτος τὸν δίκαιον τρέχειν ὀρθῶς οὐκ ἐκώλυσεν, ὥστε καὶ τοῦτο μάρτυρ τινὲς προφάσιζονται.

sins, and, if it be expedient for the good of the soul, sometimes restores the health of the body. The ceremony made use of is as follows; the priest having said the general form of confession and absolution, and other usual prayers, dips his thumb in oil of olives, which has been blessed by the Bishop, and anoints the sick person, in the form of the cross, upon the eyes, ears, nose, mouth, hands, and feet, and at each anointing makes use of the following form of prayer, adapting it to that sense which is anointed; "Through his holy unction, and his own most tender mercy, may the Lord pardon thee whatever sins thou hast committed by thy *sight*. Amen."

The Church of England understands St. James's words "as relating to a miraculous power, and not to a function that was to continue in the Church, and to be esteemed a sacrament^s." And we find that so long as the power of performing miracles remained in the Church occasional mention is made of diseases being cured by anointing with oil. In the seventh century the practice of anointing the sick was introduced, and a peculiar office was made for it; but even then it is evident that the rite was resorted to only in order to their recovery from bodily diseases.

I shall adduce only two passages, which will shew, that in the primitive Church this anointing was used as a visible means of performing miraculous cures; from whence it will be clear that no such sacrament was received in those times.

^s BURNET, Art. xxv.

Tertullian, urging the benefit the heathens had received from the Christians, says; "How many men of rank (for I do not speak of the common people,) have been cured either from the possession of demons, or from sickness? Even Severus himself, the father of Antoninus; had a strong regard for the Christians. For he sought out the Christian Proculus, (who was surnamed Torpacion,) the procurator of Eubodea, who had once cured him with oil, and he kept him in his palace unto the time of his death^t."

The other instance I shall adduce is from Augustine; "Why, our opponents ask, are not those miracles now performed, which you declare have been performed?" He then mentions that miracles are less frequent, and those less splendid, than in the times of the Apostles, nevertheless, they are still performed, and he mentions several for the truth of which he vouches; amongst others, he says, "I knew a certain damsel of Hippo, who, when she had anointed herself with oil, into which the priest praying for her had dropped some of his tears, was presently cured of a devil.—Again, at the same place, the son of one Irenæus a revenue collector had died of sickness, and when his body was lying lifeless, and the obsequies were being made ready by the mourners, one of his friends amongst other words of consolation suggested, that the youth's body should be anointed with the oil of the

^t TERTULL. *ad Scap.* c. 4.—qui eum per oleum aliquando curaverat.

same Martyr (Stephanus). It was done, and he revived^u.”

The last section of this Article will be sufficiently illustrated in the twenty-eighth and twenty-ninth Articles, and therefore need not be further considered in this place.

ARTICLE XXVI.

Of the unworthiness of Ministers, which hinders not the effect of the Sacraments.

“ALTHOUGH in the visible Church the evil be ever mingled with the good, and sometimes the evil have chief authority in the ministration of the Word and Sacraments, yet forasmuch as they do not the same in their own name, but in Christ’s, and do minister by his commission and authority, we may use their Ministry, both in hearing the word of God, and in receiving of the Sacraments. Neither is the effect of Christ’s ordinance taken away by their wickedness, nor the grace of God’s gifts diminished from such, as by faith and rightly do receive the Sacraments ministered unto them; which be effectual, because of Christ’s institution and promise, although they be ministered by evil men.

^u AUGUST. *de Civitate Dei*, l. xxii. c. 8. Hipponensem quandam virginem scio, cum se oleo perunxisset,—mox a dæmonio fuisse sanata.—amico-

rum ejus quidam inter aliorum consolantium verba suggessit, ut ejusdem martyris oleo corpus perungeretur. Factum est, et revixit.

“ Nevertheless it appertaineth to the discipline of the Church, that enquiry be made of evil Ministers, and that they be accused by those that have knowledge of their offences; and finally, being found guilty, by just judgment, be deposed.”

It was a subject of dispute in the primitive Church, whether it was necessary to rebaptize those who had been baptized by heretics. Cyprian maintained the affirmative. And in the fourth century the Donatists did rebaptize those who came over to their party. But these cases, though they are usually quoted, as if the discussion was revived at the time of the Reformation, do not in fact bear on this Article, for in them it was contended that the sacrament of Baptism was not properly given, because the person administering it was altogether disqualified; whereas in this Article the Minister is supposed to have been regularly ordained; and not to have lost his right to minister the Sacraments, by lawful deposition.

The Anabaptists at the time of the Reformation, in their detestation of the vices of the Roman clergy, declared that the personal sins of Ministers must do away with the efficacy of the Sacraments. Against this extreme severity the present Article was framed: many passages need not be given in its support. If the opinion of the Anabaptists were true, it would have been difficult for any of them to tell whether they had ever been baptized or no.

The Church of Rome agrees with us in the doctrine of this Article, but holds that the *intention* of

the Minister is essential to make a Sacrament effectual.

The latter part of the Article, which says that evil Ministers should be deposed, is denied by no one, and therefore requires no proof; it was probably added in order to obviate any objection that might be made to the apparent levity with which the wickedness of Ministers is treated in the former part of the Article.

Chrysostom says; “It was not right that those who draw near with faith to the symbols of our salvation, should be hindered by the wickedness of another^x.” Again, “Neither baptism, nor the body of Christ ought to be administered by them, if grace looked for worthiness every where; but now God is wont to work even by such as are unworthy, and the grace of baptism is not at all hindered by the life of the priest^y.”

And Augustine, over and over again, says the same thing; “Remember that the manners of evil men in no respect hinder the Sacraments of God, so as to make them not be at all, or less holy^z.”

“A minister, that is, a dispenser of the Word and Sacraments of the Gospel, if he be a good man, is an associate with the Gospel; but if he be a

^x CHRYSOST. in Johan. Hom. lxxxvi. p. fin. Καὶ γὰρ οὐδὲ δίκαιον ἦν διὰ τὴν ἐτέρου κακίαν εἰς τὰ σύμβολα τῆς σωτηρίας ἡμῶν τοὺς πίστει προσήκοντας παραβλάπτεσθαι.

^y Idem, in 1. Cor. Hom. viii. p. init.—*οὐνὶ δὲ καὶ δι' ἀναξίων ἐνεργεῖν ὁ Θεὸς εἴωθε, καὶ*

οὐδὲν τοῦ βαπτίσματος ἡ χάρις παρὰ τοῦ βίου τοῦ ἱερέως παραβλάπτεται.

^z AUGUST. c. Lit. Petil. l. ii. c. 47. Memento ergo sacramentis Dei nihil obesse mores malorum hominum, quo illa vel omnino non sint, vel minus sancta sint.

bad man, he is not therefore no dispenser of the Gospel.—Peter preached it, as did likewise other good men: and so did Judas, though unwillingly; and yet being sent together with them, he also preached it: they have reward for dispensing it, though its dispensation was likewise committed to him ^a.”

“ It matters not as to the integrity of baptism, how much the worse he is that administers it: for there is not so much difference between bad and worse, as there is between good and bad; and yet when a bad man baptizes, he does not give any other thing than a good man does ^b.”

ARTICLE XXVII.

Of Baptism.

“ Baptism is not only a sign of profession, and mark of
“ difference, whereby Christian men are discerned from
“ others that be not christened; but it is also a sign of
“ Regeneration, or New Birth, whereby, as by an instru-

^a Idem, *ibid*, l. iii. c. 55.
Minister ergo, id est, dispensator verbi et sacramenti Evangelici, si bonus est, consocius est Evangelii; si autem malus est, non ideo dispensator non est Evangelii.—

^b AUGUST. *de Bapt. c. Donat.* l. vi. c. 24. Sed nihil interest ad integritatem baptismi quanto pejor id tradat:—et tamen cum baptizat malus, non aliud dat quam bonus.

“ment, they that receive Baptism rightly, are grafted
“into the Church; the promises of forgiveness of sin,
“and of our adoption to be the sons of God by the Holy
“Ghost, are visibly signed and sealed; Faith is con-
“firmed, and Grace increased by virtue of prayer unto
“God. The Baptism of young children is in any wise to
“be retained in the Church, as most agreeable with the
“institution of Christ.”

We have here again asserted, what in the twenty-fifth Article was said generally of Sacraments, that “Baptism is not only a sign of profession, and mark of difference, whereby Christian men are discerned from others that be not christened.” There are some, such are the Socinians, the Society of Friends, and all Antibaptists, who maintain that baptism is only a visible ceremony, whereby men, who are converted from Judaism or Paganism, are admitted into Christianity, but that it is not to be used in a family already Christian: consequently they deny to it any invisible grace.

Without taking any distinct notice of the several effects which baptism is here said to produce, it will suffice to give the extracts generally, from which it will be seen that the expressions used in this Article are fully borne out by the authority of the Fathers.

There was no dispute on the subject of Infant Baptism, for at least, the first ten centuries of the Christian era; Wall thought that Peter Buis, a Frenchman, whose followers were called Petrobrussians, was the first Antipædobaptist teacher,

who formed a Church, about A. D. 1030. The Anabaptists of Germany sprung up early in the fifteenth century, the framers of this Article must have had them in view, as there was no congregation of Anabaptists in this country until the following century.

Barnabas, quoting Ezekiel, c. xlvii. 7. says :

“We descend into the water full of sins and pollutions, and ascend out of it bearing fruit, having in our hearts, fear and hope towards Jesus in our Spirit ^a.”

Justin Martyr, vindicating the Christians from the abominable charges which the heathens alleged against them, speaks of the two sacraments of Baptism and the Lord's Supper; of the first he gives the following account; “In what manner we dedicate ourselves to God, being made new by Christ, I will now declare to you.—As many as are persuaded and do believe that those things, which are taught and declared by us, are true, and who promise to lead lives according to them, are instructed by us to pray and to ask of God, with fasting, forgiveness of their former sins; and we also pray and fast together with them. Then they are brought by us to a place where there is water, and are regenerated by the same manner of regeneration by which we ourselves were regenerated: for they are washed with water in the name of God the Father and Lord of all things, and

^a BARNABÆ, *Epist.* s. 11.
Ἡμεῖς μὲν καταβαίνομεν εἰς τὸ
ὕδωρ γέμοντες ἁμαρτιῶν καὶ ῥύπου,
καὶ ἀναβαίνομεν καρποφοροῦντες ἐν

τῇ καρδίᾳ, τὸν φόβον καὶ τὴν
ἐλπίδα εἰς τὸν Ἰησοῦν ἔχοντες ἐν
τῷ πνεύματι.

of our Saviour Jesus Christ, and of the Holy Ghost. For Christ says, ‘unless ye be born again, ye cannot enter into the kingdom of heaven^b’; but every body knows it is impossible for those that are once born to enter again into their mother’s womb^c.”

The same author, in his Dialogue with Trypho, arguing that the Jewish rites are now useless, says: “Therefore, by the washing of repentance and of the knowledge of God, which was instituted for the sins of the people of God, as Isaiah^d cries out, we have believed, and we make known that that very baptism which he before declared, which alone is able to cleanse those that repent, that that is the water of life. But those cisterns, which you have dug for yourselves, are worn out, and of no use to you whatsoever. For what benefit is there in that baptism which cleanses the flesh and the body only? Baptize your soul from anger, and from avarice, from envy, and from hatred, and behold thy body is clean^e.” It may be objected that in the foregoing passage, the expression of “baptism” is only used in a figurative sense: but it was not necessary that Justin in that part of his

^b John, iii. 3, 5.

^c JUSTIN. *Apol.* 1^a. c. 61.—
Ἐπειτα ἄγονται ὑφ’ ἡμῶν ἐνθα
ὑδωρ ἔστι, καὶ τρόπον ἀναγεννήσεως
ὃν καὶ ἡμεῖς αὐτοὶ ἀνεγεννήθημεν,
ἀναγεννώμενται. Ἐπ’ ὀνόματος γὰρ
τοῦ Πατρὸς τῶν ὅλων καὶ Δεσπότου
Θεοῦ, καὶ τοῦ Σωτῆρος ἡμῶν Ἰησοῦ
Χριστοῦ, καὶ Πνεύματος Ἁγίου τὸ
ἐν τῷ ὕδατι τότε λουτρὸν ποι-
οῦνται.—

^d Isaiah, i. 16.

^e Idem, *Dial. cum Tryph.*
c. 14. Διὰ τοῦ λουτροῦ οὖν τῆς
μετανοίας καὶ τῆς γνώσεως τοῦ
Θεοῦ ὃ ὑπὲρ τῆς ἀνομίας τῶν λαῶν
τοῦ Θεοῦ γέγονεν, ὡς Ἡσαΐας βοᾷ,
ἡμεῖς ἐπιστευσάμεν, καὶ γνωρίζο-
μεν ὅτι τοῦτ’ ἐκεῖνο ὃ προηγόρευε
τὸ βάπτισμα, τὸ μόνον καθαρῖσαι
τοὺς μετανοήσαντας δυνάμενον,
τοῦτό ἐστι τὸ ὕδωρ τῆς ζωῆς.—

argument should be more explicit: he is so however on another occasion. Having urged that the observance of the ceremonial law ought to cease after the coming of Christ, he proceeds: "We who have access to God through him, have not received that circumcision, which is according to the flesh, but a spiritual circumcision, which Enoch and those like him observed; and we by the mercy of God, have received it by baptism, because we were sinners, and it is enjoined upon all to receive it by the same way^f."

Here baptism is, in express words, declared to be the means by which spiritual circumcision is to be attained.

"The creatures also which sprung from the waters were blessed of God, that this might be a sign, that men were to receive repentance and remission of sins by water, and the laver of regeneration, even as many as come to the truth, and are born again; and receive the blessing from God^g."

Irenæus, speaking of Christ, says: "Giving his disciples the power of regeneration to God, he said to them, 'Go, and teach all nations, baptizing them in the name of the Father and of the Son, and of the Holy Ghost^h i'."

^f JUSTIN. *Dial. cum Tryph.* c. 43.—ἡμεῖς δὲ διὰ τοῦ βαπτίσματος αὐτὴν, (περιτομὴν), ἐπειδὴ ἁμαρτωλοὶ ἐγεγόνειμεν, διὰ τὸ ἔλεος τὸ παρὰ τοῦ Θεοῦ, ἐλάβομεν, καὶ πᾶσιν ἐφετὸν ὁμοίως λαμβάνειν.

^g THEOPHIL. *ad. Autolyc.* l. ii. c. 16.—ὅπως ἡ καὶ τοῦτο εἰς δεῖγμα τοῦ μέλλειν λαμβάνειν τοὺς ἀνθρώπους μετάνοιαν καὶ ἄφεσιν

ἁμαρτιῶν διὰ ὕδατος καὶ λουτροῦ παλιγγενεσίας, πάντας τοὺς προσιόντας τῇ ἀληθείᾳ, καὶ ἀναγεννωμένους καὶ λαμβάνοντας εὐλογίαν παρὰ τοῦ Θεοῦ.

^h Matt. xxviii. 19.

ⁱ IRENÆUS, l. iii. c. xix. s. 1. Et iterum potestatem regenerationis in Deum dans discipulis, dicebat eis, *Euntes docete*, etc.

Clement of Alexandria, having observed that our Lord being God is perfect, says: "that he was baptized by John, because it was necessary for him, as man, to fulfil his duty as such, though he learnt nothing from John." Clement then continues: "But is he made perfect by washing only, and is he sanctified by the coming of the Spirit. Just so. And this same thing happens also with regard to us, of whom the Lord was a pattern; being baptized, we are enlightened; being enlightened, we are adopted sons; being adopted sons, we are made perfect; being made perfect, we are rendered immortal. His words are, 'I have said ye are Gods, and ye are all the children of the most Highest^k.'" But in many ways this work is called, giving grace, and illumination, and making perfect, and washing; washing indeed, whereby we wipe away our sins; but grace by which the punishments due to our sins are remitted; illumination, by which that holy and saving light is beheld, that is, by which we see God; and perfect, we call that to which nothing is wanting^l."

And further on in the same chapter, having observed how darkness and ignorance lead men into sin, he says, "But these bonds how quickly are they loosed; by human faith, by divine grace, our sins being forgiven by means of one all-

^k Ps. lxxxii. 6.

^l CLEM. ALEX. *Pædag.* l. i. c. 6. p. 113.—βαπτίζόμενοι,

φωτιζόμεθα· φωτιζόμενοι, υιοποιούμεθα· υιοποιούμενοι, τελειούμεθα. τελειούμενοι, ἀπαθανατιζόμεθα.

sufficient cure, that is by baptism according to the word^m.”

Tertullian begins his treatise on baptism with these words: “Happy sacrament of our water, whereby being cleansed from the sins of our old blindness, we are made free unto eternal lifeⁿ.”

Further on he compares the water of baptism to the pool of Bethesda, and supposes that an angel gives to the water its spiritual efficacy, and considers the healing of the flesh in that pool to have been typical of the spiritual healing by baptism; “That figure of bodily medicine sung prophetically of the spiritual medicine, in the same manner that carnal things always in a figure precede the spiritual:—they who freed one man once in the space of a year, now daily preserve whole people, death being blotted out by the washing away of sins. For the guilt being taken away, the punishment also is taken away. So man, who was of old in the image of God, is restored by God to his likeness: for he recovers that Spirit of God, which he then received from his breathing, but afterwards lost through sin.

“Not that we attain the Holy Ghost in the water, but being cleansed by the water we are prepared by the angel for the Holy Ghost. Here too a figure preceded: for so John was the forerunner of our Lord, preparing his way; so also the angel

^m Idem, *ibid*, p. 116. τὰ δὲ δεσμὰ ταῦτα, ἧ τὰχος ἀνίεται· πίστει μὲν ἀνθρωπίνῃ, θεϊκῇ δὲ τῇ χάριτι· ἀφιεμένων τῶν πλημμελημάτων ἐνὶ Παιονίῳ φαρμάκῳ. λογικῷ βαπτίσματι.

ⁿ TERTULL. *de Baptismo*, c. 1. Felix sacramentum aquæ nostræ, quâ abluti delictis pristinæ cæcitatæ, in vitam æternam liberamur.

who witnesses the baptism, prepares the way for the Holy Ghost, which is to follow, by the washing away of sins, which washing faith obtains, being sealed in the Father, and in the Son, and in the Holy Ghost °.”

The efficacy of baptism administered by heretics was much questioned in the primitive Church, Cyprian in the following passage is referring to this point : “ If they are not in the Church, and what is more, if they act contrary to the Church, how can they baptize with the baptism of the Church ? For it is no small and trifling concession which is made to heretics by our admitting their baptisms, since from thence begins the source of all faith, the saving entrance to the hope of eternal life, and acceptance with God for his servants who are to be purified and made alive. For if a person may be baptized by heretics, he may therefore obtain remission of sins. If he obtain remission of sins, he is also sanctified, and made the temple of God ^p. ”

Another passage from Cyprian, at the same time that it asserts the doctrine of this Article, will be found applicable to a large class of dissenters of the present day, who object to the use of the word ‘regeneration’ in our baptismal service. He is again arguing against the baptism of heretical mi-

° Idem, *ibid*, c. 6. —ita et angelus baptismi arbiter superventuro Spiritui Sancto vias dirigit ablutione peccatorum, quam fides impetrat, obsignata in Patre et Filio et Spiritu Sancto.

^p CYPRIANI, Ep. lxxiii. s. 10, 11.—Namsi baptizari quis apud hæreticos potuit, utique et remissam peccatorum consequi potuit : si peccatorum remissam consecutus est, et sanctificatus est, et templum Dei factus est.

nisters, and says : “ How absurd is that too, that, when there is a second spiritual birth, whereby we are born in Christ through the washing of regeneration, they should say that any amongst the heretics can be spiritually born where they deny the Spirit to be. For water alone cannot cleanse sins, and sanctify a man, unless it has also the Holy Ghost. So that they must of necessity admit either that the Holy Ghost is there, where they say there is baptism, or that there is no baptism where the Holy Ghost is not, because there cannot be baptism without the Holy Ghost.—For that that is baptism in which the old man dies, and the new man is born, the blessed Apostle shews and proves, when he says, ‘ he has saved us by the washing of regeneration ^q.’ But if regeneration be in the washing, that is in baptism, how can heresy, which is not the bride of Christ, beget sons to God through Christ ^r. ”

Cyril of Jerusalem says to the Catechumens who were about to be baptized : “ This proffered

^q Tit. iii. 5.

^r CYPRIANI, Ep. lxxiv. *ad Pompeium*. Illud quoque quàm ineptum est, ut cum nativitas secunda spiritalis sit, quâ in Christo per lavacrum regenerationis nascimur, dicant quòd possit quis apud hæreticos spiritaliter nasci, ubi spiritum negant esse. Peccata enim purgare et hominem sanctificare aqua sola non potest, nisi habeat et Spiritum Sanctum. Quare aut Spiritum Sanctum necesse est concedant esse illic ubi bap-

tisma esse dicunt, aut nec baptismus est ubi Spiritus Sanctus non est, quia baptismus esse sine Spiritu Sancto non potest.—Baptismus enim esse in quo homo vetus moritur et novus nascitur, manifestat et probat beatus Apostolus dicens : *Servavit nos per lavacrum regenerationis*. Si autem in lavacro, id est in baptismo, est regeneratio, quomodo generari filios Deo hæresis per Christum potest, quæ Christi sponsa non est ?

baptism is a great thing; it is a ransom for the captives; the remission of sins; the death of sin; the regeneration of the soul: a bright garment; a holy and indissoluble seal; a carriage to heaven; the enjoyment of paradise; the pledge of the kingdom of heaven; the grace of adoption into sonship^s."

"This is the grace and power of baptism; not bringing a deluge upon the world, as formerly, but purifying every one from his sins, and entirely removing the obstructions or spots which are caused by wickedness.—To speak in few words, we are to consider the power of baptism as a contract with God for a second life, and a more pure conversation,—there being no second regeneration^t."

Chrysostom, speaking of the Jewish rite of purification and of Christian baptism, says;

"That Jewish purification did not free them from their sins, but only from bodily defilements; ours however is not such, but far greater, and abounding with much grace, for it frees us from our sins, and cleanses the soul, and gives us the guidance of the Spirit^u."

Augustine is arguing against suicide, and that it

^s CYRIL. HIEROS. *Præfat. Cateches.* Μέγα τὸ προκείμενον βάπτισμα, αἰχμαλώτοις λύτρον· ἁμαρτημάτων ἄφεις· θάνατος ἁμαρτίας· παλιγγενεσία ψυχῆς· ενδυμα φωτεινόν· σφραγὶς ἁγία ἀκατάλυτος, ὄχημα πρὸς οὐρανόν· παραδείσου τρυφή· βασιλείας πρόξενον· νιοθεσίας χάρισμα.

^t GREG. NAZ. *Orat.* xl. p.

641. Αὕτη μὲν ἡ τοῦ βαπτίσματος χάρις καὶ δύναμις, οὐ κόσμον κατακλυσμὸν ὡς πάλαι, τὴν δὲ τοῦ καθ' ἑκάστον ἁμαρτίας κάθαρσιν ἔχουσα.

^u CHRYSOST. *Hom. xxiv. de Baptismo Christi.* —καὶ γὰρ ἁμαρτημάτων ἀπαλλάττει, καὶ ψυχὴν ἀποσμήχει, καὶ Πνεύματος δίδωσι χωρηγίαν.

is not to be committed in order to avoid falling into sin; he says, that if ever it could be defended on the ground of avoiding future sins, it would be immediately after baptism:

“If we should ever allow of this reason, it must come to that pitch, that men should be exhorted rather to kill themselves at that moment, when being cleansed by the washing of holy regeneration, they have received remission of all their sins. For that is the time to beware of all future sins, when all that are past are blotted out^x.”

In the next place we proceed to shew that Infant Baptism was universally practised in the primitive Church. This has been fully done by Wall; all the following passages may be seen in his work.

Justin Martyr says, “Many, both men and women, of sixty or seventy years old, who were made disciples unto Christ from their childhood, do continue uncorrupted^y.” The Greek word *ἐμαθητεύθησαν*, here used, is the same as that in which our Saviour’s command to his disciples is expressed, “Go ye and *teach* all nations, baptizing them, etc.” Hence it is plain that Justin speaks of their being baptized in infancy.

And Irenæus says, that “Christ came to save all men by himself; all, I say, who through him are born again unto God; infants, and little ones, and boys, and young men, and old men. There-

^x AUGUST. *de Civit. Dei*, l. i. c. 27. —cum lavacro sanctæ regenerationis abluti, universorum remissionem acceperint peccatorum.

^y JUSTIN. *Apol.* 1^a. c. 15. —Καὶ πολλοὶ τινες καὶ πολλὰ ἐξηγοντοῦται καὶ ἐβδόμηγοντοῦται, οἱ ἐκ παιδῶν ἐμαθητεύθησαν τῷ Χριστῷ, ἄφθοροι διαμένονσι.

fore he went through the several ages ; for infants being made an infant, sanctifying infants ; to little ones he was made a little one, sanctifying those of that age, etc.²” Irenæus in saying that Christ saves “all who through him are born again,” undoubtedly means, that they are born again by baptism. It is unnecessary to prove at any length that this manner of speaking was common with Irenæus and others of the Fathers ; the passage from the same author which has been given under the first part of this Article, may be referred to as affording a fair exposition of his meaning in this last extract.

Tertullian, it is well known, was opposed to infant baptism, except in cases of absolute necessity, that is to say, where there was danger of a child’s dying before it reached maturity : but his very opposition shews what the general practice was.

Origen having spoken of original sin, continues :

“ Besides all this, it may be asked, what is the reason that, whereas the baptism of the Church is given for remission of sins, baptism is given also to infants by the usage of the Church : when, if there were nothing in infants that needed forgiveness and mercy, the grace of baptism would seem to be superfluous^a.”

And in another place, where he speaks of original sin, he says^b : “ For this also the Church derived

² IRENÆUS, l. ii. c. xxii. s. 4. —omnes, inquam, qui per eum renascuntur in Deum ; infantes, et parvulos, et pueros, et juvenes, et seniores.

^a ORIGEN. in Lev. Hom. viii. c. 3. —secundum Ecclesiæ observantiam etiam parvulis baptismum dari :—

^b Ante, Art. ix.

from the Apostles a tradition to give baptism even to infants. For they, to whom the divine mysteries were committed, knew that there is in all persons the natural pollution of sin, which must be washed away by water and the Spirit ; by reason of which the body itself is also called the body of sin^c.”

Fidus, an African bishop, wrote to the bishops who usually assembled at Carthage, for the purpose of consulting upon, and settling any important affairs of the Church ; and in his letter he asked their opinion on two points, one of which only need now be noticed, viz. whether a child might be baptized before it was eight days old ? The answer of Cyprian and his colleagues, amounting to the number of sixty-six, contains the following passages :

“ As regards the case of infants, whom you suppose ought not to be baptized within the second or third day after their birth ; and that the law of ancient circumcision is to be considered, so that none should be baptized and sanctified before the eighth day after he is born ; all in our assembly were of a clear contrary opinion. For in this which you thought ought to be done, no one was of your mind ; but on the contrary all of us judged that the mercy and grace of God is to be denied to no person that is born.—

“ But if any thing could hinder men from obtaining this grace ; their more grievous sins would

^c ORIGEN. in *Ep. ad Rom.* cepit etiam parvulis baptismum dare.
l. v. c. 9. Pro hoc et Ecclesia
ab Apostolis traditionem sus-

rather hinder the adult and grown and elder men. If, then, to the greatest offenders, and to those that have before grievously sinned against God, when they afterwards come to believe, remission of sins is granted, and no one is debarred from baptism and grace; how much more ought not an infant to be forbidden, who being but newly born hath yet in no way sinned, except that, being born after Adam in the flesh, he hath contracted the contagion of the old death from his very birth? who is on this very account the more easily admitted to receive remission of sin, that not his own but another's sins are remitted to him^d."

Gregory Nazianzen, arguing against those half Christians who sought out pretences for delaying their baptism, says, "Hast thou an infant child? Let not wickedness have the advantage of time, let him be sanctified from infancy; let him be dedicated from his cradle to the Spirit. Thou, as a faint-hearted mother and of little faith, art afraid of giving him the seal, because of the weakness of nature^e."

Chrysostom, shewing the great advantage that baptism had over circumcision, says: "But our circumcision, I mean the grace of baptism, gives

^d CYPRIAN. Ep. lix. *ad Fidum*, s. 2. 4. Quantum vero ad causam infantium pertinet, quos dixisti intra secundum vel tertium diem, quo nati sint, constitutos baptizari non oportere,—longè aliud in concilio nostro omnibus visum est.—

^e GREG. NAZ. Orat. xl. *de*

Baptismo, s. 4. Νήπιόν ἐστὶ σοὶ; μὴ λαβέτω καιρὸν ἢ κακία, ἐκ βρέφους ἀγιασθήτω, ἐξ ὀνύχων καθιερωθήτω τῷ Πνεύματι. In other places, however, this author recommends the baptism of infants to be deferred two or three years.

cure without pain, and procures us a thousand benefits, and fills us with the grace of the Spirit. And it has no determinate time as that had ; but it is lawful for one in the very beginning of his life, or in the middle of it, or in old age, to receive this circumcision made without hands ; in which there is no trouble to be undergone, but to throw off the load of sins, and receive pardon for all foregoing offences^f.

ARTICLE XXVIII.

Of the Lord's Supper.

“ The Supper of the Lord is not only a sign of the love
 “ that Christians ought to have among themselves one to
 “ another ; but rather is a Sacrament of our redemption
 “ by Christ's death : insomuch that to such as rightly,
 “ worthily, and with faith receive the same, the bread
 “ which we break is a partaking of the body of Christ,
 “ and likewise the cup of blessing is a partaking of the
 “ blood of Christ.

“ Transubstantiation (or the change of the substance
 “ of the bread and wine) in the Supper of the Lord
 “ cannot be proved by Holy Writ, but is repugnant to
 “ the plain words of Scripture, overthroweth the nature

^f CHRYSOST. Hom. xl. in *Genes. p. fin.* — καὶ οὐδὲ ὁρισ- ἀλλ' ἔξεστι, καὶ ἐν ἀώρῃ ἡλικία,
 μένον ἔχει καιρὸν καθάπερ ἐκεῖ, καὶ ἐν μέσῃ, καὶ ἐν αὐτῷ τῷ γήρῃ,
 κ. τ. λ.

“ of a Sacrament, and hath given occasion to many superstitions.

“ The body of Christ is given, taken, and eaten in the Supper, only after a heavenly and spiritual manner. And the mean whereby the body of Christ is received and eaten in the Supper, is faith.

“ The Sacrament of the Lord's Supper was not by Christ's ordinance reserved, carried about, lifted up, or worshipped.”

This Article, after having condemned the notion, that the Sacrament of the Lord's Supper, is only a sign of the love that Christians ought to have among themselves, proceeds to state that it is “ a sacrament of our redemption by Christ's death :” it then asserts, what is more briefly expressed in our Church Catechism, that “ the body and blood of Christ are verily and indeed taken and received by the faithful in the Lord's Supper.”

The Roman doctrine of transubstantiation is next condemned. Protestant writers generally ascribe the discovery of this doctrine to one Paschaise, a French monk, in the ninth century ; though the Romanists of course assert that it is the doctrine of the primitive Church. The term “ transubstantiation ” was not introduced until the thirteenth century, and then the doctrine was for the first time sanctioned by the third Lateran Council, A. D. 1215.

The seventeenth article of the creed of pope Pius IV. is as follows : “ I profess likewise, that in the Mass, is offered to God a true, proper, and propitiatory sacrifice, for the living and the dead ;

and that in the most holy Sacrament of the Eucharist, there is truly, really, and substantially, the body and blood, together with the soul and divinity, of our Lord Jesus Christ ; and that there is made a conversion of the whole substance of the bread into the body, and of the whole substance of the wine into the blood, which conversion the Catholic Church calls transubstantiation."

In the third section of our Article is more plainly expressed the manner in which the body and blood of Christ are " verily and indeed taken and received," viz. by faith. This therefore will, with the one preceding that against transubstantiation, form but one proposition.

The Article in conclusion, mentions some of those superstitions to which the doctrine of transubstantiation has given occasion.

The extracts from the Fathers given under this Article may be classed under three heads ; first, will be placed those which shew that they did not hold the doctrine of transubstantiation : secondly, that faith is the mean whereby the body and blood of Christ are received and eaten in the Lord's Supper : and thirdly, that they did not carry about, lift up, or worship, the sacramental elements. That this sacrament is not only a sign of Christian love, " but rather a sacrament of our redemption by Christ's death," will be sufficiently clear from the passages given under the above heads without making that the subject of distinct proof.

First, then, *The Fathers did not hold the Romish doctrine of transubstantiation.*

Ignatius, speaking of the unity which should exist amongst Christians, uses this expression: “breaking one and the same bread, which is the medicine of immortality, our antidote that we shall not die, but live for ever in Jesus Christ ^a.”

And the following passages may shew in what way Ignatius understood those expressions in the Gospels in which the flesh of Christ is spoken of: “Do you therefore resume a mild endurance and refresh yourselves in faith, which is the flesh of the Lord, and in Charity which is the blood of Jesus Christ ^b.”

Again, “I do not delight in the food of corruption, nor in the pleasures of this life; I desire the bread of God, the heavenly bread, the bread of life, which is the flesh of Jesus Christ the Son of God, who was born in this latter time of the seed of David and of Abraham; and I desire for drink his blood, which is incorruptible charity, and eternal life ^c.”

Justin Martyr, in a passage which will be given more at length under the thirtieth Article, evidently supposes the bread and wine to remain after

^a IGNAT. *ad Ephes.* s. 20.
“Ἐνα ἄρτον κλῶντες, ὅς ἐστι φάρμα-
κον ἀθανασίας, ἀντίδοτος τοῦ ἀπο-
θανεῖν, ἀλλὰ ζῆν ἐν Θεῷ διὰ Ἰησοῦ
Χριστοῦ.

^b Idem, *ad Trall.* s. 8.—
ἐν πίστει, ὅ ἐστι σὰρξ τοῦ Κυρίου, ἐν

ἀγάπῃ, ὅ ἐστιν αἷμα Ἰησοῦ Χριστοῦ.

^c Idem, *ad Rom.* s. 7.—
ἄρτον τοῦ Θεοῦ θέλω, ἄρτον οὐράνιον,
ὅ ἐστι σὰρξ Ἰησοῦ Χριστοῦ—καὶ
πόμα θέλω τὸ αἷμα αὐτοῦ, ὅ ἐστιν
ἀγάπη ἁφθαρτος, καὶ αἰνναος ζωῆ.

the consecration ; he says that the deacons, “ give to each of those who are present, a portion of the bread and of the wine and water, which have been blessed, and carry away some to those who are not present ^d :” he then points out wherein the consecrated elements differ from common bread and wine, and says that by them, “ our flesh and blood are nourished.”

Irenæus is very plain :

“ As the bread, which is from the earth, after the divine invocation upon it, is no longer common bread, but the Eucharist, consisting of two things, the one earthly, the other heavenly ; so also our bodies partaking of the Eucharist, are no longer corruptible ^e.”

“ Ye well know that he also partook of wine ; for he too was a man ; and he blessed the wine, saying, ‘ Take, drink, this is my blood ;’ the blood of the vine ; the Word, which is poured forth for many for the remission of sins, he describes figuratively as a holy fountain of joy :—but that it was wine which was blessed, he afterwards shewed, when he said to his disciples, ‘ I will not drink of this fruit of the vine, until I drink it new with you in the kingdom of my Father ^f’ ^g.”

^d JUSTIN. *Apol.* 1^a. c. 65.—
οἱ καλούμενοι παρ’ ἡμῖν, διάκονοι
διδάσιν ἐκάστῳ τῶν παρόντων
μεταλαβεῖν ἀπὸ τοῦ εὐχαριστηθέντος
ἄρτου καὶ οἴνου καὶ ὕδατος.—

^e IRENÆI, l. iv. c. 18. s. 5.
Ὡς γὰρ ἀπὸ γῆς ἄρτος προσλαμ-
βανόμενος τὴν ἐκκλησίαν τοῦ Θεοῦ

οὐκέτι κοινὸς ἄρτος ἐστίν, ἀλλ’
εὐχαριστία, ἐκ δύο πραγμάτων
συνεστηκυῖα, ἐπιγείου τε καὶ
οὐρανίου.—

^f Matt. xxvi. 29.

^g CLEM. ALEX. *Pædag.* l. ii.
c. 2. p. 186. —ὅτι δὲ οἶνος ἦν
τὸ εὐλογηθὲν, ἀπέδειξε πάλιν, πρὸς

It must be remembered that Marcion held that the world was created by an evil and imperfect being, who was the God of the Old Testament, and that the true and perfect God sent his Son Jesus Christ to destroy the works of the evil one : Tertullian therefore argues that if Marcion's tenets were true, Christ could not really have had that love that he manifested towards men, inasmuch as they were the creation of an evil being—

“ But he until this time, hath despised neither the water of the creator, with which he washes his own in baptism ; nor the oil, with which he anoints them ; nor the mixture of honey and milk, with which he nurtures his own ; nor the bread, by which he represents his own body, since even in his own sacraments he has need of these beggarly elements of this evil creator^h. ”

And in his fourth book against Marcion he calls bread “ the figure of Christ's body : ” in the place from which this extract is taken, Tertullian is proving the reality of Christ's human nature :

“ When he professed, therefore, that he earnestly desired to eat the passoverⁱ, as his own, (for it is unworthy of God to desire any thing that does not belong to himself,) the bread which he took and distributed to his disciples, he made his own body, saying, ‘ this is my body^k ; ’ that is, a figure of my

τοὺς μαθητὰς λέγων· Οὐ μὴ πῖω,
κ. τ. λ.

^h TERTULL. *adv. Marcion.*
l. i. c. 14. —nec panem quo

ipsum corpus suum repræsen-
tat.

ⁱ Luke, xxii. 15.

^k Ib. 19.

body. But it could not have been a figure, unless the body were real¹."

And Origen says :

"The meat sanctified by the divine invocation and address, as to the material part, goeth into the belly, and thence is avoided downwards :—it is not the matter of the bread, but the word that is spoken upon it, which profiteth him that worthily eateth of it^m."

And on our Saviour's words, "Except ye eat my flesh, and drink my blood, ye have no life in you", Origen remarks ; "Consider that these things which are written in the divine volume are figures ; and therefore examine and understand the things which are spoken as spiritual, and not as carnal men. For if you understand them as carnal men they hurt you, and nourish you not. For even in the Gospels is there letter that killeth. Not only in the Old Testament letter that killeth is found ; but also in the New is there letter that killeth him that doth not spiritually understand the things that are spoken. For if thou shouldst follow according to the letter, this very thing which was said, 'Except ye eat my flesh, and drink my blood,' this letter killeth^o."

¹ TERTULL. *adv. Marcion.* l. iv. c. 40. Acceptum panem et distributum discipulis, corpus illum suum fecit, hoc est corpus meum dicendo, id est, figura corporis mei.

^m ORIGEN. *in Matt. xv.* *Comm.* tom. xi. s. 14. p. 499. Τὸ ἀγιάζόμενον βρώμα διὰ λόγου

Θεοῦ καὶ ἐντεύξεως, κατ' αὐτὸ μὲν τὸ ὑλικὸν εἰς τὴν κοιλίαν χωρεῖ, καὶ εἰς ἀφεδρώνα ἐκβάλλεται.

ⁿ JOHN, vi.

^o ORIGEN. *in Levit.* Hom. vii. s. 5. Agnoscite quia figuræ sunt quæ in divinis voluminibus scripta sunt, et ideo tanquam spiritalis et non tanquam car-

St. Cyprian, also, speaking against those who gave the communion in water only, without wine mingled with it, says : “ Forasmuch as Christ says, ‘ I am the true vine ;’ therefore the blood of Christ is not water, but wine. Nor can his blood, whereby we are redeemed and have life, seem to be in the cup, when there is no wine in the cup, whereby the blood of Christ is represented^p. ” And again shortly afterwards : “ On the day of his passion, taking the cup, he blessed it and gave it to his disciples, saying, ‘ Drink ye all of it ; for this is my blood of the new testament, which is shed for many for the remission of sins. But I say unto you, I will not drink henceforth of this fruit of the vine, until that day when I drink it new with you in my Father’s kingdom^q. ’ Whereby we find that the cup, which the Lord offered, was mixed, and that it was wine which he called his blood : whence it is clear that the blood of Christ is not offered, if there be no wine in the cup^r. ”

Chrysostom, arguing against those who used water only in the sacrament, says : “ Why then after his resurrection did he not drink water, but wine ? plucking up another wicked heresy by the roots, (since there are some who use water in the

nales examine et intelligite quæ dicuntur, etc.

^p CYPRIAN. Ep. lxiii. *ad Cæcilium*, s. 2. Nec potest videri sanguis ejus, quo redempti et vivificati sumus, esse in calice, quando vinum desit calici, quo Christi sanguis ostenditur.

^q Matt. xxvi. 27-29.

^r CYPRIAN. Ep. lxiii. *ad Cæcilium*, s. 6. Quâ in parte invenimus calicem mixtum fuisse quem Dominus obtulit, et vinum fuisse, quod sanguinem suum dixit.

mysteries,) shewing, that when he gave the mysteries, he gave wine, and after his resurrection, at a common table, where the mysteries were not given, he used wine ; his words are, ‘ of the fruit of the vine ;’ but the vine brings forth wine, not water^s.”

Chrysostom says plainly enough that Christ gave wine to drink ; but I am quite in the dark as to what he means by speaking of the wine used after our Saviour’s resurrection.

“ The bread before it is sanctified, we call bread ; but when the divine grace has sanctified it, by the mediation of the priest, it is delivered from the name of bread ; and is deemed worthy of being called the Lord’s body, although the nature of bread still remains in it^t.”

“ That which you see, is the bread and the cup, which also your eyes do shew you ; but your faith further sheweth, that the bread is the body of Christ, the cup the blood of Christ.—How is the bread his body ? and the cup, or that which the cup contains, how is that his blood ? They, my brethren, are therefore called Sacraments, because in them one thing is seen, another understood.

^s CHRYSOST. in *Matt.* xxvi. Hom. lxxxii. s. 2. —δεικνύς ὅτι, ἡνίκα τὰ μυστήρια παρέδωκεν οἶνον παρέδωκε.—

^t Idem, ad *Cæsarium Monachum*, ed. Bened. t. iii. p. 744. Sicut enim antequam sanctificetur panis, panem nomina-

mus ; divinâ autem illum sanctificante gratiâ, mediante sacerdote, liberatus est quidem ab appellatione panis ; dignus autem habitus Dominici corporis appellatione, etiamsi natura panis in ipso permansit.

That which is seen has a corporeal form, what is understood, has a spiritual fruit^u."

It is next to be shewn that the Fathers held that "*the body of Christ is given, taken, and eaten,*" but, "*only after a spiritual manner.*" And that "*the mean whereby the body of Christ is received and eaten in the Supper, is faith.*"

Justin Martyr in continuation of the passage which will be found under the thirtieth Article, says :

" And this food is called amongst us *Eucharistia*; whereof it is lawful for no man to be partaker, except he believes those things, which are taught by us to be true, and be washed in the water of regeneration unto the remission of sins, and so liveth as Christ has commanded. For we do not take these things as common bread or common drink; but like as Jesus Christ our Saviour being incarnate by the word of God, had both flesh and blood for our salvation; so we are taught that this food, which hath been blessed by the prayer of the word proceeding from him, and by which our flesh and blood are by transmutation nourished, is the flesh and blood of that incarnate Jesus. For the Apos-

^u AUGUST. *ad Infantes*
Serm. 272. Quod videtis,
panis est et calix, quod vobis
etiam oculi vestri renuntiant;
quod autem fides vestra postulat
instruenda, panis est corpus
Christi, calix sanguis Christi.
—Quomodo est panis corpus

ejus? et calix, vel quod habet
calix, quomodo est sanguis
ejus? Ista, fratres, adeo dicuntur
sacramenta, quia in eis aliud videtur,
aliud intelligitur. Quod videtur speciem
habet corporalem, quod intelligitur,
fructum habet spiritalem.

tles in those works of theirs, which are called Gospels, have delivered that Jesus so commanded them; having taken bread and given thanks he said, ‘this, is my body;’ and in like manner taking the cup, after he had given thanks, he said, ‘this is my blood;’ and gave them to his Apostles only *.”

“Christ giving commandment to his disciples to offer the first-fruits of his creatures to God, (not as if God had need of them, but to shew themselves neither unfruitful nor ungrateful,) received bread, which is a creature, and gave thanks, saying, ‘This is my body.’ And in like manner the cup, which is a creature of the same sort as ours, he confessed to be his blood, and he enjoined the new oblation of the New Testament †.” Again: “The Lord taking bread of the same sort that our bread is of, confessed that it was his body, and that thing which was tempered in the cup he confirmed to be his blood ‡.”

“The Lord, in the Gospel according to John,

* JUSTIN, *Apol.* 1^a. c. 66.
 —οὐ γὰρ ὡς κοινὸν ἄρτον, οὐδὲ κοινὸν πόμα ταῦτα λαμβάνομεν· ἀλλ’ ὅν τρόπον διὰ λόγον Θεοῦ σαρκοποιήθεις Ἰησοῦς Χριστὸς ὁ Σωτὴρ ἡμῶν, καὶ σάρκα καὶ αἷμα ὑπὲρ σωτηρίας ἡμῶν ἔσχευ, οὕτως καὶ τὴν δι’ εὐχῆς λόγου τοῦ παρ’ αὐτοῦ εὐχαριστηθεῖσαν τροφήν, ἐξ ἧς αἷμα καὶ σάρκες κατὰ μεταβολὴν τρέφονται ἡμῶν, ἐκείνου τοῦ σαρκοποιηθέντος Ἰησοῦ καὶ σάρκα καὶ αἷμα ἐδιδάχθημεν εἶναι.

† IRENÆI, l. iv. c. xvii. s. 5.
 Sed et suis discipulis dans consilium, primitias Deo offerre ex

suis creaturis, non quasi indigenti, sed ut ipsi nec infructuosi, nec ingrati sint, eum qui ex creaturâ panis est, accepit, et gratias egit, dicens, *Hoc est meum corpus*. Et calicem similiter suum sanguinem confessus est, et Novi Testamenti novam docuit oblationem.

* Idem, l. iv. c. xxxiii. s. 2.
 Dominus, hujus conditionis quæ est secundum nos accipiens panem, suum corpus esse confitebatur, et temperamentum calicis suum sanguinem confirmavit.

said, 'Eat my flesh, and drink my blood,' evidently speaking allegorically of faith and the promises as something to be drunk, by means of which the Church, as a man, consisting of many members, is watered and nourished ^a."

"Although he says that the flesh profiteth nothing ^b, the meaning must be governed by the subject matter of his discourse. For because they thought his saying hard ^c and intolerable, as if he had determined that his flesh was to be really eaten by them, he premised, that he placed the condition of their salvation in the Spirit. 'It is the Spirit that quickeneth ^d;' and so he added, 'The flesh profiteth nothing,' that is to say, to the giving of life. He then proceeds to tell them what he would have them understand by the Spirit; 'The words that I speak unto you, they are Spirit, and they are life ^e:' as he said in the preceding chapter, 'He that heareth my word, and believeth on him that sent me, hath everlasting life, and shall not come into condemnation, but is passed from death unto life ^f.' Therefore making the word to be that which gives life, because the word is Spirit and life, he also said that the same was his own flesh: for 'the word was made flesh,' and is therefore to be sought for as the cause of life, and to be devoured

^a CLEM. ALEX. *Pædag.* l. i. c. 6. p. 121. Ἀλλαχῶθι δὲ ὁ Κόριος ἐν τῷ κατὰ Ἰωάννην Εὐαγγελίῳ, ἐτέρως ἐξήνεγκεν διὰ συμβόλων· Φάγεσθί μου τὰς σάρκας εἰπὼν, καὶ πίεσθί μου τὸ αἶμα· ἐναργὲς τῆς πίστεως καὶ τῆς ἐπαγγελίας τὸ πότιμον ἀλληγορῶν, δι' ὧν ἡ Ἐκκλησία,

καθάπερ ἄνθρωπος, ἐκ πολλῶν συνεστηκῶτα μελῶν, ἀρδεταί τε καὶ αὔζεται.

^b John, vi. 63.

^c Ibid. 60.

^d Ibid. 63.

^e Ibid.

^f Ibid. v. 24.

by hearing, to be chewed by the understanding, and to be digested by faith^g.”

Athanasius, speaking of the eating of Christ's flesh, and drinking of his blood, says :

“ For this cause he made mention of the ascension of the Son of Man into heaven, that he might draw them off from corporeal thoughts, and that hereafter they might learn that his flesh was called the celestial meat, that came from above, and a spiritual food which he would give. ‘ For those things that I speak to you,’ he says, ‘ are spirit and life^h ; which is as much as to say, that which is shewn and given for the salvation of the world, is the flesh which I bear ; but this flesh and its blood shall be given to you by me spiritually as a nourishment, so that it shall be spiritually distributed to every one, and be to all a conservation unto the resurrection of eternal lifeⁱ.”

“ We eat his flesh and drink his blood, being made by his incarnation and sensible life, partakers of his word and wisdom : for his flesh and blood he called all his mystical conversation here in his flesh and his doctrine, consisting of his whole life, pertaining both to his humanity and divinity,

^g TERTULL. *de Resur. Carnis*. c. 37. — quia et sermo caro erat factus, proinde in causam vitæ adpetendus, et devorandus auditu, et ruminandus intellectu, et fide digerendus.

^h John, vi. 63.

ⁱ ATHANAS. Ep. iv. *ad Serap. de Spiritu Sancto*,

tom. i. p. 710. — τὸ μὲν δεκνόμενον καὶ διδόμενον ὑπὲρ τῆς τοῦ κόσμου σωτηρίας, ἐστὶν ἡ σὰρξ ἣν ἐγὼ φορῶ· ἀλλ’ αὕτη ὑμῖν καὶ τὸ ταύτης αἷμα παρ’ ἐμοῦ πνευματικῶς δοθήσεται τροφή, ὥστε πνευματικῶς ἐν ἐκάστῳ ταύτην ἀναδίδοσθαι, καὶ γίνεσθαι πᾶσιν φυλακτήριον, εἰς ἀνάστασιν ζωῆς αἰωνίου.

whereby the soul is nourished and brought to the contemplation of things eternal ^k.”

“ If any man understand the words of Christ carnally, he profits nothing thereby. What then, is not the flesh his flesh? most certainly it is. Then what did he mean by saying ‘The flesh availeth nothing?’ He did not mean it of his own flesh; God forbid! but of them that carnally receive the words spoken by him. And what is it, to understand carnally? To look simply at the words as spoken literally, and not to perceive any further intention. This is to understand carnally. But we ought not so to judge of the things which we see, but to consider all mysteries with inward eyes; that is, to understand them spiritually ^l.”

Augustine, laying down rules for the application of a figurative or literal interpretation of Scripture, says; “ If the speech be preceptive, forbidding any evil or wickedness, or commanding what is useful or charitable, it is not figurative. But if it seems to command any evil or wicked act, or to forbid what is useful or charitable, it is figurative.

^k BASIL. Ep. viii. (al. 141.)

s. 4. Τρώγομεν αὐτοῦ τὴν σάρκα, καὶ πίνομεν αὐτοῦ τὸ αἷμα, κοινωνοὶ γινόμενοι διὰ τῆς ἐνανθρωπήσεως καὶ τῆς αἰσθητῆς ζωῆς, τοῦ λόγου καὶ τῆς σοφίας· σάρκα γὰρ καὶ αἷμα, πᾶσαν αὐτοῦ τὴν μυστικὴν ἐπιδημίαν ὠνόμασε, καὶ τὴν ἐκ πρακτικῆς καὶ φυσικῆς καὶ θεολογικῆς συνεστῶσαν διδασκαλίαν ἐδήλωσε, δι’ ἧς τρέφεται ψυχὴ, καὶ πρὸς τὴν τῶν ὄντων τέως θεωρίαν παρασκευάζεται.

^l CHRYSOST. in Joan, Hom. xlvii. (al. 46.) ed, Bened. t. viii.

p. 278.—τί οὖν, οὐκ ἔστι ἡ σὰρξ αὐτοῦ σὰρξ; καὶ σφόδρα μὲν οὖν καὶ πῶς εἶπεν, ἡ σὰρξ οὐκ ὠφελεῖ οὐδέν; οὐ περὶ τῆς ἑαυτοῦ σαρκὸς λέγων· μὴ γένοιτο· ἀλλὰ περὶ τῶν σαρκικῶς ἐκλαμβάνόντων τὰ λεγόμενα· τί δὲ ἔστι τὸ σαρκικῶς νοῆσαι; τὸ ἀπλῶς εἰς τὰ προκείμενα ὁρᾶν, καὶ μὴ πλέον τι φαντάζεσθαι τοῦτο γάρ ἐστι σαρκικῶς· χρεὶ δὲ μὴ οὕτω κρίνειν τοῖς ὁρωμένοις, ἀλλὰ πάντα τὰ μυστήρια τοῖς ἐνδον ὀφθαλμοῖς κατοπτεῖν· τοῦτο γάρ ἐστι πνευματικῶς.

Now he says ‘Except you eat the flesh of the Son of Man and drink his blood, ye shall have no life in you.’ This seems to command an evil and wicked thing; therefore it is a figure, commanding us to partake of Christ’s passion, keeping in our minds to our great comfort and profit, that his flesh was crucified and wounded for us ^m.”

It remains to be shewn that in the primitive Church, “*The Sacrament of the Lord’s Supper was not reserved, carried about, lifted up, or worshipped.*” The practice of the Roman Church here condemned, arose out of their doctrine of transubstantiation; and that being proved to be untrue and unscriptural, this practice must necessarily fall with it. It is not possible to adduce passages from the Fathers directly condemning this practice, for it was never so much as thought of in the primitive Church. There are two passages, however, which are satisfactory and conclusive on the point in question.

Origen says, “The Lord said to them concerning the bread which he gave to his disciples; ‘Take and eat;’ he did not defer it, nor command it to be reserved till the morrow ⁿ.”

And Jerome tells us, that “After the communion, whatever remained of the sacred elements, the

^m AUGUST. *de Doctrina Christ.* l. iii. c. 4.—*Nisi manducaveritis*, inquit, etc. *Faci-mus vel flagitium videtur jubere: figura est ergo, præci-piens passioni Dominicæ com-municandum, et suaviter atque*

utiliter recondendum in me-moriâ, quod pro nobis caro ejus crucifixa et vulnerata sit.

ⁿ ORIGEN, *in Lev. Hom.* v. s. 8.—non distulit, nec servari jussit in crastinum.

communicants themselves, eating a common supper in the Church, consumed together °.”

For want of earlier testimony to the above may be added the following from Hesychius, who was a presbyter of the Church of Jerusalem in the fifth century. He is commenting on Levit. vii. 17. and says, “ Whatever remained of the flesh and the bread, God commanded to be burnt with fire [on the third day.] Which we now with our own eyes see done in the Church ; whatever happens to remain unconsumed is immediately burnt with fire, and that not after it has been kept one, or two, or many days p.”

ARTICLE XXIX.

Of the wicked which eat not the body of Christ in the use of the Lord's Supper.

“ THE wicked, and such as be void of a lively faith, although they do carnally and visibly press with their teeth, (as St. Augustine saith,) the sacrament of the

° HIERON. in 1 Cor. 11.
Et post communionem quæcunque eis de sacrificiis superfuissent, illi in Ecclesiâ communem cœnam comedentes pariter consumeabant.

p HESYCH. in Lev. l. ii.
Quod reliquum est de carnibus

et panibus, in igne incendi præcepit. Quod nunc videmus etiam sensibiliter in ecclesiâ fieri, ignique tradi quæcunque remanere contigerit inconsumta ; non omnino ea quæ unâ die, vel duabus aut multis, servata sunt.

“body and blood of Christ; yet in no wise are they
 “partakers of Christ, but rather to their condemnation do
 “eat and drink the sign or sacrament of so great a
 “thing.”

This Article arises out of the preceding, and was chiefly directed against the Romanists, who are said to contend, that the mere receiving of the Lord's Supper, merits remission of sins *ex opere operato*, that is mechanically, without any good disposition of the communicant. But Dupin^a says, “that the body and blood of Christ are truly and really received by all, though none but the faithful partake of any benefit from them.” If this be in truth the doctrine of the Roman Church, then the only difference between us in this Article is that which has been already considered, as to transubstantiation. But in that case every passage in which it is mentioned that the wicked do not receive the body and blood of Christ, will be an additional authority against transubstantiation.

Origen, in continuation of a passage given under the preceding Article, says^b;

“Much might be said of the Word which was made flesh and very meat, which whoso eateth shall surely live for ever; which no evil man can eat. For if it were possible for one that continueth evil to eat the Word made flesh, seeing that he is the Word and bread of life, it would not have been written, that, “Whosoever eateth this bread shall live for ever.”^{c d}”

^a Appendix to Mosheim, 3.

^b Ante, p. 325.

^c John. vi. 51.

^d ORIGEN. in Matt. xv.

Again, "Dost thou not fear to communicate of the body of Christ, when thou comest to the Eucharist, as if thou wast clean and pure, as if there was nothing unworthy in thee? And in all these things to escape the judgment of God? Dost thou not remember what is said, "For this many are weak and sick, and many sleep amongst you? Why are many weak? Because they do not judge nor examine themselves, nor understand what it is to communicate with the Church, or what it is to approach to such and so great sacraments. They suffer that which those that are sick of fevers used to suffer, whilst they presume to eat of the food of the healthy, bringing destruction on themselves".

And Cyprian, speaking of those who had lapsed in times of persecution, and afterwards desired to be admitted to partake of the Lord's Supper, says, "He that is down threatens them that stand, and he that is wounded them that are whole: and because he may not immediately receive the Lord's body in his polluted hands, or drink the Lord's blood with his defiled mouth, the sacrilegious fellow is angry with the priests. But oh thy exceeding madness, thou furious person! Thou

Comm. tom. xi. s. 14.—οὐδενὸς
δυναμένου φαῦλον ἐσθίειν αὐτήν· εἰ
γὰρ οἷν τε ἦν ἔτι φαῦλον μένοντα
ἐσθίειν τὸν γενόμενον σάρκα, λόγον
ὄντα, καὶ ἄρτον ζῶντα, οὐκ ἂν
ἐγέγραπτο, ὅτι πᾶς ὁ φαγὼν τὸν
ἄρτον τούτου ζήσεται εἰς τὸν
αἰῶνα.

* *Idem, in Ps. xxxvii.*
Hom. ii. s. 6. Patiuntur hoc
quod febricitantes pati solent,
cum sanorum cibos præsumunt,
sibimetipsis inferentes exitium.

art angry with him, who strives to turn the wrath of God from thee ! thou threatenest him that beggeth the mercy of God for thee, who is sensible of thy wound, which thou thyself art not sensible of, who sheds tears for thee, which perhaps thou sheddest not thyself^f.”

“ Let us therefore cleanse ourselves from all pollution, and so let us come to these holy things, that we may escape the condemnation of those that killed the Lord : for whosoever eateth the bread, or drinketh the cup of the Lord unworthily, shall be guilty of the body and blood of the Lord^g.”

“ All that love pleasure more than they love God—neither eat the flesh of Jesus, nor drink his blood : of the which himself saith, ‘ Whoso eateth my flesh and drinketh my blood, hath eternal life^{h, i}.’ ”

Augustine’s testimony is as clear as possible, not only in the place referred to by the Article, but also in many others, some of which may be subjoined.

“ He that doth not eat his flesh, nor drink his blood, hath not life in him : and he that eateth his

^f CYPRIAN. *de Lapsis*. s. 18. —quod non statim Domini corpus inquinatis manibus accipiat, aut ore polluto Domini sanguinem bibat, sacerdotibus sacrilegus irascatur.—Irasceris ei, qui abs te avertere iram Dei nititur.—

^g BASIL. *de Baptismo*. l. ii. qu. 3. Καθαρεύσωμεν τοίνυν ἀπὸ παντὸς μολυσμοῦ, καὶ οὕτω προσερχώμεθα τοῖς ἁγίοις, ἵνα φύγω-

μεν τὸ κρίμα τῶν φονευσάντων τὸν Κύριον, διότι ὅς ἂν ἐσθίῃ τὸν ἄρτον, ἢ πίνη τὸ ποτήριον τοῦ Κυρίου ἀναξίως, κ. τ. λ.

^h John, vi. 54.

ⁱ HIERON. *in Isai*. lxvi. 17. Omnes voluptatis magis amatores quam amatores Dei—nec comedunt carnem Jesu, neque bibunt sanguinem ejus : de quo ipse loquitur, etc.

flesh and drinketh his blood, hath life. But in either case *eternal* life is meant. But it is not so in that food which we take for the support of our mortal bodies: for although without that we cannot live; yet whosoever taketh that shall not necessarily live. For it may happen that many, who do take it, may die of old age, or disease, or other chances. But in this meat and drink, that is, of the body and blood of our Lord, it is otherwise. For both whoso taketh them not, hath not life, and whoso taketh them, hath life, and that everlasting^k."

And shortly afterwards: "The sacrament of this thing, that is to say, of the unity of the body and blood of Christ, at some places every day, in others at stated periods, is prepared at the Lord's table, and is thence taken, by some men to life, but by others to destruction; but the thing itself, whereof it is a sacrament, is taken by all men, who do partake of it, to life, of no man to death^l."

A little further on we come to the passage quoted in this Article: "'He that eateth my flesh, and drinketh my blood, dwelleth in me, and I in him.' This therefore is to eat that meat, and to drink that drink, to dwell in Christ and to have Christ dwelling in him. And for that cause he that dwelleth not in Christ, and in whom Christ dwelleth not,

^k AUGUST. in *Joan. Tract.* xxvi. s. 15. —Nam et qui eam non sumit non habet vitam; et qui eam sumit, habet vitam, et hanc utique æternam.

^l Idem, *ibid.* —sumitur

quibusdam ad vitam, quibusdam ad exitium; res vero ipsa, cujus sacramentum est, omni homini ad vitam, nulli ad exitium, quicumque ejus particeps fuerit,

without doubt neither spiritually eateth his flesh, nor drinketh his blood, although carnally and visibly he press with his teeth the sacrament of the body and blood of Christ: but rather to his own condemnation he eats and drinks the sacrament of so great a thing^m."

And in the next Homily upon saint John he says: "To-day our discourse is of the body of the Lord, which he said he would give to eat for eternal life. But he declared the manner of his gift and distribution, how he would give his flesh to eat, saying, 'He that eateth my flesh and drinketh my blood, dwelleth in me, and I in him.' This therefore is a token that a man hath eaten and drunken, that is to say, if he dwell in Christ, and have Christ dwelling in him; if he so cleave to Christ, that he is not severed from him. This therefore he taught and admonished us by these mystical words, that we should be in his body under him our head amongst his members, eating his flesh, not forsaking his unityⁿ."

^m Idem, *ibid*, xxvi. s. 18.
—Ac per hoc qui non manet in Christo, et in quo non manet Christus, procul dubio nec manducat [spiritaliter] carnem ejus, nec bibit ejus sanguinem, [licet carnaliter et visibiliter premat dentibus sacramentum corporis et sanguinis

Christi:] sed magis tantæ rei sacramentum ad judicium sibi manducat et bibit.

ⁿ Idem, *ibid*, xxvii. s. 1.
—Signum quia manducavit et bibit, hoc est, si manet et manetur, si habitat et inhabitatur, si hæret ut non deseratur.—

ARTICLE XXX.

Of both Kinds.

“THE Cup of the Lord is not to be denied to the lay-people; for both the parts of the Lord’s Sacrament, by Christ’s ordinance and commandment, ought to be ministered to all Christian men alike.”

The eighteenth Article of the creed of pope Pius IV., is as follows : “I confess also, that under either kind alone, Christ whole and entire and a true sacrament is received.”

Dr. Chaloner, whom I have before quoted, calls their receiving in one kind “a matter of discipline only ;” though it is matter of faith that under one kind they receive Christ whole and entire, and the true sacrament. Neither he, nor any other writer of the same persuasion, denies that it was the practice of the primitive Church to receive in both kinds : he says, “the Catholic Church did, and may again, if she pleases, allow of the communion in both kinds^a.”

The practice of withholding the cup from the laity is another of those “many superstitions” to which the Romish doctrine of transubstantiation has given occasion. In order to avoid spilling the

^a Sect. vi.

real blood of Christ, the bread was at first sopped in the wine, and at length, about the twelfth century, the cup was withheld from the laity. Dr. Chaloner, says, that it has been "the custom and discipline of the Catholic Church for many ages to administer this sacrament to the laity only in one kind, viz. under the form of bread, by reason of the danger of spilling the blood of Christ, if all were to receive the cup; which discipline was confirmed by the general Council of Constance in opposition to the Hussites, who had the rashness to condemn in this point the practice of the universal Church." The Council of Constance was holden, A. D. 1414, and in their decree it is acknowledged that "Christ did institute this sacrament in both kinds, and that the faithful, in the primitive Church, did receive in both kinds; yet a practice being reasonably introduced to avoid some dangers and scandals, they appoint the custom to continue of consecrating in both kinds, and of giving to the laity only in one kind."

After this admission it is unnecessary to shew what was the practice of the primitive Church, but some passages must be adduced, from which it will appear that this sacrament was only properly received, when it was taken in both kinds.

Having described the form of baptizing an adult convert to Christianity, Justin proceeds to mention the mode in which the Sacrament was administered.

"We then having so washed him who has testi-

fied his faith in, and assent to our doctrine, lead him to those who are called brethren, when they are gathered together, to make common prayers with earnestness both for ourselves and for him who is now enlightened, and for all others in all places, that, having learned the truth, we may be deemed worthy to be found men of a godly life, and observers of the commandments, that so we may attain unto eternal salvation. Having ceased from prayer we salute one another with a kiss. Then there is brought to that one of the brethren who presides, bread and a cup of water and wine mixed. And he having received them, offers up glory and praise to the Father of all things, through the name of the Son and of the Holy Ghost, and gives thanks at length for that they have been thought worthy to obtain these things from God. When he has finished his prayers and thanksgivings, all the people who are present express their assent, saying, Amen, which in the Hebrew tongue means, So be it. But when he that presides has given thanks, and all the people have expressed their assent, those whom we call deacons, give to each of those who are present, a portion of the bread and of the wine and water, which have been blessed, and carry away some to those who are not present ^b."

"The baptism of saving water is but once received, and is not to be repeated; but the cup of

^b JUSTIN. *Apol.* 1^a. c. 65. See the Greek, ante p. 323, note ^d.

the Lord is always thirsted after and drank in the Church^c."

"To shew forth the justification and the testament of our Lord, and not to do the same that our Lord hath done ; what else is this, but to cast his sayings behind us, to despise the Lord's discipline, and to commit, not earthly, but spiritual thefts and adulteries ? Since he who steals from the truth of the Gospel such words as our Lord hath spoken, and such facts as he hath done, corrupts and adulterates the divine precepts^d."

And again, "How do we teach and encourage those who are to fight Christ's battles, to spend their blood in the confession of his name, if when they are going to engage, we deny them the blood of Christ ? Or how do we make them fit for the cup of martyrdom, if we do not first admit them to drink in the Church the cup of the Lord, of which they have a right to partake^e."

"Not as it was in the Old Testament, the priest ate some things, and the people other things, and it was not lawful for the people to partake of those

^c CYPRIAN. Ep. lxxiii. *ad Cæcilium*, s. 5. —calix Domini in Ecclesiâ semper et sititur et bibitur.

^d Idem, *ibid*, s. 13. —dum quis de Evangelicâ veritate furatur Domini nostri verba et facta, et corrumpit atque adulterat præcepta divina.

^e Idem, Ep. liv. *ad Corne-*

lium, s. 2. Nam quomodo docemus aut provocamus eos in confessione nominis sanguinem suum fundere, si eis militaturis Christi sanguinem denegamus ? aut quomodo ad martyrii poculum idoneos facimus, si non eos prius ad bibendum in Ecclesiâ poculum Domini jure communicationis admittimus ?

things of which the priest partook ; it is not so now, but one body and one cup is offered to all^f.”

ARTICLE XXXI.

Of the one Oblation of Christ finished upon the Cross.

“ THE Offering of Christ once made, is that perfect redemption, propitiation, and satisfaction for all the sins of the whole world, both original and actual ; and there is none other satisfaction for sin but that alone. Wherefore the sacrifice of Masses, in the which it was commonly said, that the Priest did offer Christ for the quick and the dead, to have remission of pain or guilt, were blasphemous fables, and dangerous deceits.”

Another of those many superstitions, to which the Romish doctrine of transubstantiation has given occasion, is here aimed at. The Romanists, believing that the bread and wine are by consecration changed into the real body and blood of Christ, consider that in the Eucharist a real, propitiatory sacrifice is offered up to God the Father at every celebration. The seventeenth Article of the creed of pope Pius IV., part of which relates to this sub-

^f CHYSOST. in 2 Cor. Hom. —ἀλλ' οὐ νῦν, ἀλλὰ πᾶσιν ἐν σῶμα πρόκειται καὶ ἐν ποτήριον.
xiv. ed. Bened. tom. viii. p. 537.

ject, has been already given at length^a; it is there said, "in the Mass, is offered to God a true, proper, and propitiatory sacrifice, for the living and the dead." Masses are constantly being celebrated in their Churches by the priest alone, in the name of particular persons who pay for them, and also in behalf of departed souls, which are supposed to be detained in purgatory, and which they think by these propitiatory sacrifices to release. These are called solitary masses, but were totally unknown in the primitive Church, and were not established until the twelfth century, after the doctrine of transubstantiation was generally received.

The point to be now established, on the authority of the Fathers, is that they believed the offering of Christ once made to be that perfect redemption, propitiation, and satisfaction for all the sins of the whole world, both original and actual; and consequently that the Eucharist is not a propitiatory sacrifice.

The first part of the proposition seems to be little more than a re-assertion of the doctrine of the Atonement; the rest follows as the necessary consequence of that doctrine. But as under the eleventh Article the true and Catholic doctrine of the Atonement was established, it remains only in this place to shew that the Fathers did not consider the sacrament of the Lord's Supper to be a propitiatory sacrifice.

It is true that they frequently use expressions,

^a Ante, p. 320.

such as are to be found both in the Old and New Testaments, in which prayers, praises, and thanksgivings are called “sacrifices;” and in the same sense, but in no other, they call the Eucharist a “sacrifice:” how different this is from the Popish belief of a *propitiatory* sacrifice in the mass, the following extracts will shew.

Justin Martyr says: “Prayers and thanksgivings, which are offered up by those that are worthy, are the only perfect sacrifices and acceptable unto God. For Christians have received commandment to perform these only, in commemoration of their own nourishment, both dry and wet, wherein also mention is made of the suffering which God underwent by God himself^b.” The word here translated “thanksgiving,” includes the sacrament of the Eucharist, but surely Justin could never have spoken thus of that sacrament if in it was offered up a propitiatory sacrifice; nor could have classed it with the sacrifices of prayer.

So Clemens of Alexandria says:

“The sacrifices to God are prayer and praises, and reading of the Scriptures, before meals; and psalms and hymns during meals, and at bed-time, and in the night^c.”

Tertullian, having remarked that the Israelites were commanded to offer sacrifices only in the promised land, proceeds: “The Holy Spirit after-

^b JUSTIN, *Dial. cum Tryph.*
c. 117. Καὶ εὐχαὶ καὶ εὐχαρισ-
ταίαι ὑπὸ τῶν ἀξίων γινόμεναι, τέ-
λειαι μόναι καὶ εὐαρεστοί εἰσι τῷ
Θεῷ θυσίαι.

^c CLEM. ALEX. *Strom.* vii.
c. 7. p. 860. Θυσίαι τῷ Θεῷ
εὐχαί τε καὶ ᾄνοι, κ. τ. λ.

wards declares by the Prophets, why it should come to pass that sacrifices should be offered to God in every land, and in every place, as he speaks by Malachi, one of the twelve Prophets, ‘Neither will I accept an offering at your hand : For from the rising of the sun even to the going down of the same, my name shall be great among the Gentiles ; and in every place incense shall be offered unto my name, and a pure offering ; for my name shall be great among the heathen, saith the Lord of hosts^d.’ David also says in the Psalms : ‘ Give unto the Lord, O ye kindreds of the people^e :’ without doubt because the preaching of the Apostles would go out into all the earth, ‘ Give unto the Lord glory and strength, give unto the Lord the glory due unto his name : bring an offering and come into his courts.’ Because God was to be entreated not with earthly, but with spiritual sacrifices, so we read as it is written : ‘ The sacrifices of God are a broken spirit^f :’ and in another place : ‘ Offer unto God the sacrifice of praise, and pay thy vows unto the Most High^g.’ Thus therefore the spiritual offerings of praise are shewn to be sacrifices, and a contrite heart is declared to be a sacrifice acceptable to God. In the same way therefore as carnal sacrifices are understood to be rejected, of which Isaiah speaks, when he says, ‘ To what purpose is the multitude of your sacrifices unto me^h ?’ so spiritual sacrifices are declared to be accepted, as the

^d Malachi, i. 10, 11.^e Ps. xvi. 7, 8.^f Ibid, li. 17.^g Ibid, l. 14.^h Isaiah, i. 11.

Prophets proclaim : ‘ Bring no more vain oblations, incense is an abomination unto me^{i k}.’ Could Tertullian have used such language as this, if he had considered the Eucharist to be a propitiatory sacrifice ?

Cyprian says : “ We celebrate the resurrection of our Lord early in the morning. And because we make mention of his passion in all our sacrifices (for the passion of the Lord is the sacrifice which we offer,) we ought to do nothing else but what he did¹. ”

I have selected this passage from Cyprian because Pamelius has made use of it in support of the Romish doctrine condemned in this Article. But it is very clear that when Cyprian says, “ the passion of the Lord, is the sacrifice which we offer,” he is speaking of a mystical passion, and a spiritual sacrifice ; that this is so, is obvious from the preceding words “ we *make mention* of his passion,” that is, in the action, we should not mention the reality, when the reality itself was being acted ; we should (as we do) when the figure only is acted.

“ What then ? do we not offer every day ? we do offer ; but doing it in remembrance of his death—this is done in remembrance of what was then done ; for he says, ‘ Do this in remembrance

ⁱ Ibid, 13.

^k TERTULL. *adv. Judæos*. c. 5. Sic itaque sacrificia spiritalia laudis designantur, et cor contribulatum acceptabile sacrificium Deo demonstratur.

¹ CYPRIAN. Ep. lxiii. *ad Cæ-*

cilium. s. 12. —et quia passionis ejus mentionem in sacrificiis omnibus facimus, (passio est enim Domini, sacrificium quod offerimus), nihil aliud quam quod ille fecit, facere debemus.

of me ! We do not offer another sacrifice, as the chief priest of old, but always the same ; or rather make a resemblance of Christ's sacrifice ^m."

In what way Chrysostom applied the term "sacrifice," may be seen by the following passage : "How can the body be made a sacrifice ? Let the eye behold nothing evil, and it is made a sacrifice. Let the tongue utter nothing that is base, and it is made an offering. Let the hand do nothing that is unlawful, and it is made a whole burnt offering ⁿ."

Augustine speaks home to the point : "We often speak in this way, as to say when Good-Friday is near at hand, 'to-morrow or the next day is our Lord's passion,' although he suffered so many years back, and that passion was never suffered but once. Likewise on Easter-day we say, 'This day our Lord rose from death ;' although so many years have passed since he rose. Why then does no one reprove us as liars, when we speak in this way, but because we call these days so, by a similitude of those days wherein these things were really done ? So that it is called that day, which is not the very day, but by the revolution of time it corresponds with that day ; and that is said to

^m CHRYSOST. in *Ep. ad Heb.* c. x. Hom. xvii. ed. Bened. tom. xii. p. 168, 9. Τὸ οὖν ; ἡμεῖς καθ' ἐκάστην ἡμέραν οὐ προσφέρομεν ; προσφέρομεν μὲν, ἀλλ' ἀνάμνησιν ποιούμενοι τοῦ θανάτου αὐτοῦ—τοῦτο εἰς ἀνάμνησιν γίνεται τοῦ τότε γενομένου· τοῦτο γὰρ ποιῶντες, φησιν, κ. τ. λ. οὐκ ἄλλην θυσίαν, καθάπερ

ὁ ἀρχιερεὺς τότε, ἀλλὰ τὴν αὐτὴν ἀεὶ ποιούμεν· μᾶλλον δὲ ἀνάμνησιν ἐργαζόμεθα θυσίας.

ⁿ Idem, in *Ep. ad Rom.* Hom. xx. p. init. Πῶς ἂν γένοιτο τὸ σῶμα, θυσία ; Μηδὲν ὀφθαλμοῦς πονηρὸν βλέπω, καὶ γέγονε θυσία, κ. τ. λ.

be done on that day on account of the celebration of the sacrament, which thing is not done on that day, but was done a long time back. Was not Christ once offered in his very self? And yet in a sacrament, not only on every solemn feast of Easter, but every day, he is offered to the people; so that he doth not lie, who, being asked, shall answer, that he is offered. For if sacraments had not some similitude of those things whereof they are sacraments, they could not be sacraments at all. But from this similitude they commonly have the name of the things themselves. Therefore as after a certain manner, the sacrament of Christ's body is Christ's body, the sacrament of Christ's blood is Christ's blood, so the sacrament of faith is faith.—The sacrament therefore of so great a thing is called only by the name of the thing itself^o.”

And again he says: “That which men call a sacrifice, is a sign of the true sacrifice^p.”

“Before the coming of Christ the flesh and

^o AUGUST. *ad Bonifac.* tom. ii. p. 267. Sæpe ita loquimur, ut Pascha propinquantē dicamus, crastinam vel perendinam Domini passionem, cum ille ante tam multos annos passus sit, nec omnino nisi semel illa passio facta sit.—Nonne semel immolatus est Christus in se ipso? et tamen in sacramento non solum per omnes Paschæ solemnitates, sed omni die populus immolatur, nec utique mentitur, qui interrogatus responderit eum immolari. Si

enim sacramenta quandam similitudinem earum rerum quarum sacramenta sunt, non haberent, omnino sacramenta non essent. Ex hac autem similitudine plerumque etiam ipsarum rerum nomina accipiunt.—Sacramentum ergo tantæ rei non nisi ejusdem rei vocabulo nuncupavit.

^p Idem, *de Civitate Dei*, l. x. c. 5. Illud quod ab hominibus appellatur sacrificium, signum est veri sacrificii.

blood of this sacrifice was praised in a similitude by victims, in the passion of Christ it was offered in the truth itself; after the ascension of Christ it is celebrated by a commemorative sacrament ^q.

ARTICLE XXXII.

Of the Marriage of Priests.

“BISHOPS, Priests, and Deacons are not commanded by God’s law either to vow the estate of a single life, or to abstain from marriage: therefore it is lawful for them, as for all other Christian men, to marry at their own discretion, as they shall judge the same to serve better to godliness.”

Little need be said in support of this Article: the more ingenuous writers of the Roman Church, admit that the clergy were not forbidden to marry in the primitive Church, but they contend that it is a matter of discipline, and may be enforced, if the times require it.

To pass over the fact that the ancient writers agree in saying that most of the Apostles were married; we find that married bishops, presby-

^q Idem, *ad Faust.* l. xx. c. 21. *de Sacrificio Christi.* — sacramentum memoriæ celebratur.
post ascensum Christi per Sa-

ters, and deacons, are spoken of from the earliest times, without any suggestion being made that the marriage state was unbecoming their profession and order.

Polycarp, in his Epistle to the Philippians, speaking of Valens, who had been a presbyter amongst them, and was then accused of heresy, says: "I am exceedingly sorry both for him, and for his wife, to whom God grant a true repentance^r."

In the works of Cyprian several instances of married presbyters are mentioned. "Felix," he says, "a very near neighbour of mine, (and whom I knew very intimately,) who served in the presbytery under Decimus, and Victoria his wife, and Lucius, all of the faithful, have been banished and have left their property, which is now in the hands of the officers of the revenue^b."

"Know that we are admonished and instructed by the divine pleasure, that Numidicus the presbyter should be enrolled in the number of the Carthaginian presbytery, and should sit in convocation with us, having distinguished himself by the glorious splendour of his confession, and exalted himself by the excellency of his virtue and his faith; for by his exhortations he sent before himself a great number of martyrs to be put to death by stoning and by fire: and joyfully beheld his

^a POLYCARP. *ad Philip.* s. 11. Valde ergo, fratres, contristor pro illo et pro conjugē ejus.—

^b CALDONII *ad Cyprianum*,

ap. CYPR. Ep. xix. Felix, qui presbyterium subministrabat sub Decimo--et Victoria conjux ejus.—

wife, clinging to his side, burnt, or rather I should say preserved, with the rest. He himself half-burnt and covered with stones, and left for dead, (when his daughter, a little while after, anxiously and piously, sought for the body of her father,) was found almost lifeless, but was drawn out, and restored to life, unwillingly leaving his companions whom he had sent before him ^c.”

Eusebius also makes mention of bishops who were married, and had children, “There was a certain Chæremon, a very old man, bishop of the city of Nilus; he flying together with his wife, to the Arabian mountain, never returned from thence ^d.”

In another place he is giving an account of the many Christians who were exposed to the most cruel torments on account of their religion, and says, that amongst these was “Phileas, bishop of the Church of Thmuis; a man who had passed through the public offices and services in his own country with distinction—these, when multitudes of their kindred and friends, and besides magistrates of consideration, entreated them, nay even when the judge himself exhorted them, to take pity on themselves, and to spare their wives and children, could by no means be induced to deny the name of Christ ^e.”

^c CYPRIAN. Ep. xxxv.—Numidicus presbyter—qui uxorem adhærentem lateri suo, concrematam simul cum cæteris, (vel conservatam magis dixerim) lætus aspexit.—

^d EUSEB. l. vi. c. 42.—οὗτος εἰς τὸ Ἀράβιον ὄρος ἅμα τῇ συμβίῳ αὐτοῦ φυγὼν, οἶκ ἐπανέληλθεν.

^e Idem, l. viii. c. 9. Φιλέας τε τῆς Θμουίτῳ ἐκκλησίας ἐπίσκοπος —παρακαλοῦντος, ὡς ἂν αὐτῶν

He also observes, that “Pinytus, bishop of Gnosus in Crete, was for imposing the law of celibacy on his brethren; but Dionysius, bishop of Corinth, wrote to him, that he should consider the weakness of men, and not impose that heavy burden upon them^f.”

The above proofs are amply sufficient, without noticing what took place at the council of Nice, though none but those “who will not hear” can doubt the accuracy of the accounts, which the historians Socrates and Sozomen have left us.

ARTICLE XXXIII.

Of excommunicate Persons, how they are to be avoided.

“THAT person, which by open denunciation of the Church, is rightly cut off from the unity of the Church, and excommunicated, ought to be taken of the whole multitude of the faithful as an Heathen and Publican, until he be openly reconciled by Penance, and received into the Church by a Judge that hath authority thereunto.”

οἶκτον λάβειν, φειδῶ τε παίδων καὶ
γυναικῶν ποιήσονται, κ. τ. λ.

^f Idem, l. iv. c. 23. p. 186.

—μὴ βαρὺ φορτίον ἐπάναγκες τὸ
περὶ ἀγνείας τοῖς ἀδελφοῖς ἐπιτι-
θεῖναι.—

This Article, by implication at least, asserts the right of any particular Church to excommunicate its offending members : and then points out to “the faithful” how they ought to regard such excommunicate persons. Almost all the reformed Churches asserted this power of excommunication ; and indeed it is obvious that no society can exist for any length of time without the power of punishing its disobedient members. However, though the principle is admitted by all, it is seldom put in practice by any : in the Roman Church their sacrament of penance has nearly destroyed public discipline ; and the facility with which ejected members of our own Catholic Church can gain admittance into the congregations of sectaries, has in a great measure tended to destroy the terrors of Church censures. And this state of things will probably continue so long as the present lamentable indifference to that article of our Apostolic creed, wherein a belief is expressed in “one Catholic and Apostolic Church,” shall prevail.

In the primitive Churches such a contempt for ecclesiastical punishment could seldom be met with, except in the case of obstinate heretics, who paid no regard to Church communion ; for when a member was expelled from any Church by that sentence, called the greater Excommunication, notice was usually given to other Churches, who assisted in making the sentence effectual by refusing the privileges and benefits of communion to the excommunicated party.

It would not be possible in the compass of a few

pages to give a satisfactory account of the discipline observed throughout the primitive Churches. The subject is treated by Bingham at considerable length. It must suffice in this place to quote a section from his work, and to add a few passages from the Fathers in support of the present Article.

The following is a succinct statement of the means and objects of primitive discipline. "The discipline of the Church consisted in a power to deprive men of all the benefits and privileges of baptism, by turning them out of the society and communion of the Church, in which these privileges were only to be enjoyed; such as joining in public prayer, and receiving the eucharist, and the other acts of divine worship: and sometimes they were wholly forbidden to enter the Church, so much as to hear the Scriptures read, or hear a sermon preached, till they shewed some signs of relenting; and every one shunned and avoided them in common conversation, partly to establish the Church's censures and proceedings against them, and partly to make them ashamed, and and partly to secure themselves from the danger of contagion and infection^a."

"They" (heretics, of whom he had been before speaking) "abstain from the eucharist and from the public offices^b; because they confess not the

^a BINGH. B. xvi. c. ii. s. 2.

^b I have translated *προσευχῆς* "public offices" according to Archbishop Wake. There are

various renderings, which are noticed in Coteler's edition of the Apostolic Fathers.

eucharist to be the flesh of our Saviour Jesus Christ, which suffered for our sins, and which the Father of his goodness raised again from the dead. They then, who contradict the gift of God, die in their disputes. But much better would it be for them to receive it, that they might also rise again. It therefore becomes you to abstain from such persons, and not to speak of them, neither in private, nor in public. But to attend to the Prophets, and especially to the Gospel, in which the passion is manifested unto us, and the resurrection perfected. But flee all divisions as the beginning of evils^c."

Cyprian in a letter to Cornelius enters at some length into the subject of excommunication; a few extracts will serve to illustrate the whole of this Article. Felicissimus, who was an inferior officer of the Church in Africa, was excommunicated by Cyprian for heresy, schism, fraud, and other crimes; this sentence it will appear was acted upon generally in other Churches. The letter begins thus;

"I have read your letter, my dearest brother,—in which you inform me that Felicissimus, an enemy of Christ, (not lately, but long since interdicted for very many and grave crimes, and who was condemned not only by my sentence, but by that of many of my brother bishops,) has been rejected by you, and, when he came supported by a throng and faction of desperate persons, was driven

^c IGNAT. *ad Smyrn.* s. 7.— τοιούτων, καὶ μήτε κατ' ἰδίαν περὶ
πρέπον οὖν ἐστὶν ἀπέχεσθαι τῶν αὐτῶν λαλεῖν, μήτε κοινῇ.—

by you from the Church with that decisive vigour, with which it becomes bishops to act ^d.” Cyprian then enters at large on the necessity of strictly upholding ecclesiastical discipline, and presently continues: “As far as concerns us, it is a duty of conscience for us to take care, that no one perish out of the Church by any fault of ours: but if any shall willingly and of his own criminal obduracy perish, and will not do penance and return to the Church, we shall be blameless in the day of judgment, who have consulted for their health; they only will remain subject to punishment, who would not be healed by our wholesome counsel ^e.”

Shortly afterwards follows a passage, which is too exactly descriptive of our own times, and which has led to the present lamentable neglect of ecclesiastical discipline: “At a full council lately holden, we not only agreed in common, but decreed under the threat of punishment, that no one should hastily grant reconciliation to those that have not done penance; but they, guilty of sacrilege against God, and hurried on by impious fury against the priests of God, withdrawing from the Church, and raising their parricidal arms against her, (that they

^d CYPRIAN. Ep. lv. *ad Cornelium*, s. 1. Legi literas tuas—quibus significasti Felicissimum hostem Christi, non novum, sed jam pridem ob crimina sua plurima et gravissima abstentum, et non tantum meâ, sed plurimorum coepiscoporum sententiâ condemnatum, rejectum à te illic esse, et cum venisset stipatus catervâ et

factione desperatorum, vigore pleno, quo Episcopos agere oportet, pulsum de Ecclesiâ esse.

^e Idem, *ibid.* s. 9.—si autem quis ultro et crimine suo perierit, et pœnitentiam agere, atque ad Ecclesiam redire noluerit, nos in die judicii inculpato futuros.—

may consummate their work by the malice of the devil,) strive that the divine clemency may not cure the wounded in his Church; by deceitful lies they destroy the penitence of the wretched sinners, so that an angry God may not be appeased, nor one, who before was ashamed or feared to be a Christian, may afterwards seek Christ as his Lord, nor he, who had withdrawn from the Church, return to the Church. Pains are taken that crimes may not be atoned by righteous satisfaction and weeping, that wounds may not be washed away by tears. True peace is supplanted by a false and lying peace, the wholesome bosom of the mother is shut out by the interference of a stepmother, that weeping and groaning may not be heard from the breast and lips of the lapsed^f.”—“For the rest, let our most beloved brethren resolutely decline and avoid their words and conversation, whose ‘word will eat as doth a canker^g;’ as the Apostle says, ‘Evil communications corrupt good manners^h.’ And again, ‘A man that is an heretic, after the first and second admonition reject; knowing that he, that is such, is subverted, and sinneth, being condemned of himselfⁱ.’^k”

He concludes the letter as follows :

“Our exceeding solicitude or charity persuaded

^f Idem, *ibid*, s. 13. Concilio frequenter acto, non consensione tantum nostrâ, sed et comminatione decrevimus, ut pœnitentiam non agentibus nemo temerè pacem daret, etc.

^g 2 Tim. ii. 17.

^h 1 Cor. xv. 33.

ⁱ Tit. iii. 10.

^k CYPRIAN. Ep. lv. *ad Cornelium*. s. 21. Declinent autem de cætero fortiter, et evitent dilectissimi fratres nostri verba et colloquia eorum, quorum sermo ut cancer serpit, etc.

us to write these things to you, that we should have no intercourse with such, mix in no society or converse with the wicked, but should be separated from them, so long as they are banished from the Church, because it is written, ‘But if he neglect to hear the Church, let him be unto thee as an heathen man and a publican¹.’ And the blessed Apostle not only admonishes, but commands us to withdraw from such, ‘We command you,’ he says, ‘in the name of our Lord Jesus Christ, that ye withdraw yourselves from every brother that walketh disorderly, and not after the tradition which he received from us^m.’ There can be no fellowship between faith and perfidy; he that is not with Christ, that is the adversary of Christ, that is an enemy to his unity and peace, cannot be joined with us. If they come with prayers and satisfaction, let them be heard: if they heap up curses and threats against us, let them be rejectedⁿ.”

To the above decisive testimony of Cyprian, a few short extracts from later authors may be added:

Basil writes to Athanasius concerning a certain governor of Libya, who appears to have been guilty of some grievous sin; “It was made known to our Church from your Holiness’s letter, and all will

¹ Matt. xviii. 17.

^m 2 Thess. iii. 6.

ⁿ CYPRIAN. Ep. lv. *ad Cornelium*. s. 22. —ut nulla cum talibus commercia copulentur, nulla cum malis convivia, vel colloquia misceantur, simusque

ab eis tam separati, quàm sunt illi ab Ecclesiâ profugi, quia scriptum est, etc.—Si cum precibus et satisfactionibus veniunt audiantur; si maledicta et minas ingerunt, respuantur.

consider him to be a person to be shunned, having neither fire, nor water, nor roof in common with him; if by any means those who are so wicked may be benefited by a common and unanimous condemnation^o.”

Jerome and Augustine compare expulsion from the Church to Adam's being driven out of paradise:

“They have transgressed the covenant of God in the Church, as Adam transgressed in paradise: and shew themselves followers of their first parent, that, as he was cast out of paradise, so they may be cast out of the Church^p.”

“He was to be made an alien, as one excommunicated. As also in our paradise, that is, the Church, men are by ecclesiastical discipline removed from the visible mysteries of the altar^q.”

And so highly did Augustine esteem of ecclesiastical discipline, that, though the Catholic Church held no communion with Donatists, yet he would not receive one who had been excommunicated by a Donatist bishop, without his first undergoing that penitential discipline, which he would have been obliged to, had he continued amongst them:

“I observe this rule, that when any one amongst

^o BASIL. Ep. lxi. (*al.* xlvii.) *ad Athanas.* —καὶ ἀποτρέπαιον αὐτὸν πάντες ἡγήσονται, μὴ πυρὸς, μὴ ὕδατος, μὴ σκέπης αὐτῷ κοινωνοῦντες.

^p HIERON. *Com. in Hoseam.* c. vi. —ut quomodo ille de Paradiso, sic et isti ejiciantur de Ecclesiâ.

^q AUGUST. *de Genesi ad Litteram.* l. ii. c. 40. Alienandus erat, tanquam excommunicatus. Sicut etiam in hoc Paradiso, id est, Ecclesiâ, solent à sacramentis altaris visibilibus homines disciplinâ ecclesiasticâ removeri.

them who has been degraded according to their discipline, wishes to come over to the Catholic Church, he should be admitted under the same penance, that they probably would have obliged him to, had he chosen to remain amongst them^r.”

ARTICLE XXXIV.

Of the Traditions of the Church.

“ It is not necessary that Traditions and Ceremonies be
 “ in all places one, or utterly like ; for at all times they
 “ have been diverse, and may be changed according to
 “ the diversities of countries, times, and men’s manners,
 “ so that nothing be ordained against God’s Word.
 “ Whosoever, through his private judgment, willingly,
 “ and purposely doth openly break the traditions and
 “ ceremonies of the Church, which be not repugnant to
 “ the Word of God, and be ordained and approved by
 “ common authority, ought to be rebuked openly, (that
 “ others may fear to do the like,) as he that offendeth
 “ against the common order of the Church, and hurteth
 “ the authority of the magistrate, and woundeth the con-
 “ sciences of weak brethren.

^r Idem, Ep. xxxv. (*al.* cxlix.)
ad Euseb. s. 3. Ego istum
 modum servo, ut quisquis apud
 eos propter disciplinam degra-
 datus ad Catholicam transire

voluerit, in humiliatione pœni-
 tentiæ recipiatur, quo et ipsi
 eum forsitan cogent, si apud
 eos manere voluisset.

“ Every particular or national Church hath authority to
“ ordain, change, and abolish ceremonies or rites of the
“ Church ordained only by man’s authority, so that all
“ things be done to edifying.”

Tradition here means traditional practice of human institution.

This Article contains three propositions: First, that traditions need not be in all places alike. The object of this is evidently to justify the changes made at the Reformation from the ceremonies and rites of the Romish Church.

Secondly, Individual members of a Church ought to conform to those ceremonies ordained by that authority to which they are subject, so long as nothing be ordained against God’s word. This seems to have been intended against the Puritans, who would consent to no established forms, which were not immediately derived from the word of God.

Thirdly, Each particular or National Church has authority to ordain and change its own rites.

These propositions will not require separate consideration, for if each particular Church has authority to ordain its own rites, the power of enforcing their observance must follow.

Ignatius having urged unity and submission to their bishop and other appointed ministers, says: “ If therefore the Lord did nothing without the Father, being united to him, neither by himself, nor by his Apostles; so neither do ye any thing without your Bishop, and the presbyters. Nor endeavour that any thing should appear reasonable to yourselves apart; but having come together to the same place

let there be one prayer, one supplication, one mind, one hope, in charity, in joy unblameable. There is one Jesus Christ, than whom nothing is better. All then run together as to one temple of God, as to one altar, as to one Jesus, who proceeded from one Father, and who exists in one and is returned to one^a."

Irenæus in his account of the dispute between Polycarp, bishop of Smyrna, and Anicetus, bishop of Rome, concerning the observation of Easter, says: "St. Polycarp being at Rome with Anicetus, and they having had some little controversy with each other, about other things, presently composed the difference, and shewed themselves also to be no lovers of strife upon that particular head. For neither could Anicetus persuade Polycarp to desist from observing Easter, according as he had always observed it with St. John, the Disciple of our Lord, and with the rest of the Apostles, with whom he had been conversant; nor could Polycarp persuade Anicetus to observe it otherwise, than, as he said, it was his duty to do, according to the custom of the elders who were before him. This being the case between them, they notwithstanding communicated with each other, and Anicetus yielded to Polycarp the power of celebrating the Eucharist in his church, as a mark of respect to him^b."

^a IGNAT. *ad Magnes.* s. 7.
"Ὡςπερ οὖν ὁ Κύριος ἄνευ τοῦ Πα-
τρὸς οὐδὲν ἐποίησε, ἠνωμένος ὢν,
οὔτε δι' αὐτοῦ, οὔτε διὰ τῶν Ἀποσ-
τόλων· οὕτως μηδὲ ἡμεῖς ἄνευ τοῦ
Ἐπισκόπου, καὶ τῶν πρεσβυτέρων,

μηδὲν πράσσετε·—ἀλλ' ἐπὶ τὸ αὐτὸ
μία προσευχή, μία δέησις, εἰς νοῦς,
μία ἐλπίς, κ. τ. λ.

^b IRENÆI *Fragm. ex Euseb.*
Hist. l. v. c. 24. Πολυκάρπου
ἐπιδημήσαντος τῇ Ῥώμῃ ἐπὶ Ἀνι-

In the third century it is well known that great differences of opinion were entertained in several very important points of discipline; such as the re-baptizing of heretics, whether adulterers should be re-admitted to the communion of the Church, and as to the validity of clinic baptism: the last of these only would perhaps come literally within the description of rites or ceremonies, but all tend to shew the independence of distinct Churches, and the power of the bishop. Cyprian was in a condition, if such a power had been recognised, to have enforced uniformity in the African Churches, where these questions were chiefly debated.

He was decidedly in favour of re-baptizing those who had been baptized by heretics, yet he writes to pope Stephen:

“We know that some are unwilling to lay aside what they have once adopted, and that they do not easily change their purpose, but preserving the bond of peace and concord amongst their colleagues, they retain some things peculiar to themselves, which have once been practised amongst them; wherein we neither force any one, nor lay down a law, since every bishop has the entire power of following his own will in the government of his Church, of which he must hereafter give an account to the Lord.”

κήτου, καὶ περὶ ἄλλων τινῶν μικρὰ
σχόντες πρὸς ἀλλήλους, εὐθὺς εἰρή-
νευσαν, περὶ τούτου τοῦ κεφαλαίου
μὴ φιλεριστήσαντες ἑαυτοὺς,——

^c CYPRIAN. Ep. lxxii. *ad*
Steph. s. 3. Scimus quosdam

quod semel imbibierint nolle de-
ponere, nec propositum suum
facile mutare, sed salvo inter
collegas pacis et concordiae vin-
culo, quædam propria, quæ
apud se semel sint usurpata,

And at the opening of the great Council of Carthage, which was assembled to consider this very question, he says :

“Let us every one give our opinion on this matter, judging no man, nor rejecting any from our communion, that shall think differently. For no one of us makes himself bishop of bishops, nor compels his colleagues, by tyrannical terror, to a necessity of complying ; forasmuch as every bishop according to the liberty and power that is granted him, is free to act as he sees fit ; and can no more be judged by others, than he can judge them. But let us all expect the judgment of our Lord Jesus Christ, who only hath power both to invest us with the government of his Church, and to judge us for our actions ^d.”

Cyprian was in favour of the validity of clinic baptism, yet he writes on this subject to Magnus :

“You have asked my opinion concerning those who obtain the grace of God in infirmity and languor, whether they are to be accounted complete Christians, in that they are not washed, but sprinkled only, with the saving water. In which matter my backwardness and modesty prejudices

retinere: quâ in re nec nos vim cuiquam facimus aut legem damus ; cum habeat in Ecclesiæ administratione voluntatis suæ arbitrium liberum unusquisque prepositus, rationem actus sui Domino redditurus.

^d *Conc. Carthag. ap. CYPRIAN. s. l.* Superest ut de hâc ipsâ re singuli, quid sentiamus, pro-

feramus, neminem judicantes, aut à jure communionis aliquem, si diversum senserit, amoventes. — quando habeat omnis Episcopus pro licentiâ libertatis et potestatis suæ arbitrium proprium, tamque judicari ab alio non possit, tam nec ipse potest alterum judicare.

no man, so that he should not hold what opinion he thinks right, and act according to his opinion ^e.” He then gives his own opinion in the affirmative; and at the conclusion of the letter, says, “I have shewn you what my opinion is, but prescribe to no man, so as to prevent each bishop from determining according to his own conviction; of his actions he must give an account to the Lord ^f.”

Every bishop too had liberty to form his own liturgy, and several of these, differing in many particulars from one another, have come down to our time ^g. Gregory Nazianzen has observed of Basil, “That, among other good services which he did for the Church of Cæsarea, whilst he was but a presbyter in it, one was the composing of forms of prayer, which, by the consent and authority of his bishop, Eusebius, were used by the Church ^h.”

Jerome speaking of the different customs of Churches in relation to the Saturday fast, and the daily reception of the eucharist, lays down a general rule respecting the latitude to be allowed in Church ceremonies :

“I think right that you should be briefly admonished, that ecclesiastical traditions, (espe-

^e CYPRIAN. Ep. lxxvi. *ad Magnum*. s. 9. — Quâ in parte nemini verecundia et modestia nostra præjudicat, quo minus unusquisque quod putat, sentiat, et quod senserit, faciat.

^f Idem, *ibid*, s. 12. Ostendi quid nos quantum in nobis est sentiamus, nemini præscribentes, quo minus statuatur quod

putat unusquisque præpositus actus sui rationem Domino redditurus.

^g See PALMER'S *Dissertation on Primitive Liturgies*.

^h GREG. NAZ. Orat. xx, in *Laud. Basil.* p. 340.—εὐχῶν διατάξεις, καὶ εὐκοσμίας τοῦ βήματος—and see BINGH. B. ii. c. vi. s. 2.

cially such as do not prejudice the faith) are to be observed in such manner as they have been handed down from our forefathers; nor is the custom of one Church to be subverted by the contrary custom of another.—But every province may abound in its own sense, and consider the rules of their ancestors as laws of the Apostles ⁱ.”

Augustine says :

“ In those things, concerning which holy Scripture has given no positive determination, the custom of the people of God, or the rules of our forefathers, are to be taken for laws. For if we will dispute about such matters, and condemn the custom of one Church by the custom of another, endless strife will be the consequence; which will always be diligent enough to find out plausible reasonings, when there are no certain arguments to shew the truth: great caution therefore should be used, that in the tempest of contention, we draw not a cloud over the serene brightness of charity ^k.”

And presently afterwards he adds :

“ Such contention is endless, engendering strifes, and not putting an end to disputes. Let there be

ⁱ HIERON. Ep. xxviii. *ad Lucianum Bæticum*.—Ego illud te breviter admonendum puto, traditiones ecclesiasticas (præsertim quæ fidei non officiant) ita observandas, ut à majoribus traditæ sint: nec aliorum consuetudinem aliorum contrario more subverti—Sed unaquæque provincia abundet

in suo sensu, et præcepta majorum leges apostolicas arbitretur.

^k AUGUST. Ep. xxxvi. (*al. lxxxvi.*) *ad Casulan*, s. 2. In his enim rebus de quibus nihil certi statuit Scriptura divina, mos populi Dei, vel instituta majorum pro lege tenenda sunt.—

therefore one faith of the universal Church, wherever it is spread, as intrinsical to the members of the body, although the unity of the faith be kept with some different observations, whereby the truth of the faith is in no way impaired. For all the beauty of the king's daughter is within, but those observances which are variously celebrated, are understood to be only in her outward clothing. Whence she is said to be clothed in golden fringes wrought about with divers colours^l. But let that clothing be so distinguished by different observances, that she herself be not destroyed by adverse contentions about them^m."

And in the same Epistle, in answer to Casulanus, who was perplexed by the different practice of different Churches, with respect to the Saturday-fast, some observing it as a fast, others as a festival, to satisfy his scruples, he says ;

"It seems to me that you should follow their custom, to whom the government of particular congregations has been given in charge. If therefore you will take my advice ; do not resist your bishop in this matter, but what he does, do you follow without doubt or scrupleⁿ."

^l Ps. xlv. 10.

^m Idem, *ibid.* Ep. lxxxvi. s. 22. Interminabilis est ista contentio, generans lites, non finiens quæstiones.—

ⁿ Idem, *ibid.* s. 32. Mos eorum mihi sequendus videtur,

quibus eorum populorum congregatio regenda commissa est. Quapropter si concilio meo—libenter acquiescis ; Episcopo tuo in hac re noli resistere, et quod facit ipse, sine ullo scrupulo vel disceptatione sectare.

ARTICLE XXXV.

Of the Homilies.

“THE second Book of Homilies, the several titles where-
“of we have joined under this Article, doth contain a
“godly and wholesome doctrine, and necessary for these
“times, as doth the former Book of Homilies, which
“were set forth in the time of Edward the Sixth; and
“therefore we judge them to be read in Churches by the
“Ministers, diligently and distinctly, that they may be
“understanded of the People.

Of the Names of the Homilies.

- “1. Of the right use of the Church.
- “2. Against peril of Idolatry.
- “3. Of repairing and keeping clean of Churches.
- “4. Of Good Works, first of Fasting.
- “5. Against Gluttony and Drunkenness.
- “6. Against excess of Apparel.
- “7. Of Prayer.
- “8. Of the place and time of Prayer.
- “9. That common Prayers and Sacraments ought to be
“ministered in a known tongue.
- “10. Of the reverend estimation of God's Word.
- “11. Of Alms-doing.
- “12. Of the Nativity of Christ.
- “13. Of the Passion of Christ.
- “14. Of the Resurrection of Christ.

- " 15. Of the worthy receiving of the Sacrament of the Body
" and Blood of Christ.
- " 16. Of the gifts of the Holy Ghost,
- " 17. For the Rogation-days.
- " 18. Of the state of Matrimony.
- " 19. Of Repentance.
- " 20. Against Idleness.
- " 21. Against Rebellion."

Nothing can be said by way of *proof* under this Article. It is well known that the two Books of Homilies were composed and required to be read in Churches, partly in order to supply the want of fit preachers throughout the kingdom, and partly to ensure the explanation of those fundamental doctrines of Christianity, which were then being cleared from the mists that the Church of Rome had thrown around them.

Bishop Burnet says, " Since there are so many of the Homilies that charge the Church of Rome with idolatry, and that from so many different topics, no man who thinks that Church is not guilty of idolatry, can with a good conscience subscribe this Article, ' That the Homilies contain a good and wholesome doctrine, and necessary for these times.' " It may be presumptuous to differ from so high an authority ; but in the first place it appears to me that a subscriber to this Article, is not bound to express his assent to every word and every argument made use of in each Homily ; he declares generally that they contain a godly and wholesome doctrine, with this qualification, that they were necessary " for *those* times," to which it

is admitted on all hands the expression “for *these* times” must in fair construction be limited.

But, to put the question in a different light—what is here meant by the word doctrine? If we give it its modern and more ordinary meaning, of “principles or verities,” the expression cannot (in the instance specified by Bishop Burnet) apply to the Church of Rome; it would be a matter of doctrine, that all idolatry is forbidden of God and exceeding sinful; but that the Church of Rome is, or has been, guilty of that sin, is a matter of fact or history; which brings us to the other meaning of the word “doctrine” which is “teaching:” so that a modern subscriber to this Article asserts merely, that it was wholesome and necessary to be taught in those times that the Church of Rome was guilty of idolatry; if this be so, it is difficult to see how a humble-minded member of our Church can hesitate to express his assent, without requiring any very distinct historical proof of the truth of the fact. He would be bound to admit that the ancient Bishops of our Church had been competent judges of the godliness, wholesomeness, and necessity of teaching what is contained in the Homilies more particularly referred to.

Thus much having been said as to the meaning of the Article before us, a few words may be added, with regard to the primitive practice, under similar circumstances.

It is certain that in the Eastern Churches it was usual for presbyters to preach, as is evident from those celebrated Homilies of Chrysostom delivered

by him at Antioch, and from his having preached them, while he was yet a presbyter, without the novelty of the practice being remarked by contemporary writers. In the African Churches presbyters were not permitted to preach in the presence of their bishops until the time of Augustine, when his bishop, Valerius, gave him authority to preach before him ^a.

The practice was at first objected to by other bishops, but being persevered in by Valerius, and proving beneficial, it gradually became general.

Much less usual was it for deacons to preach at all, though they might do so with the license and authority of their bishops ^b.

Where those who had authority to preach, had not the talent to compose a discourse of their own, it was by no means unusual for such to preach the written sermons of others: this custom is spoken of by Augustine as allowable, precisely in those cases provided for by our two books of Homilies, that is, in cases of *necessity*; he says:

“There are some who have a good delivery, but cannot compose a discourse of their own. But if they take that which is eloquently and wisely written by others, and commit it to memory, and preach it to the people, (if they are authorized to preach,) they are not to be found fault with ^c.”

^a POSSID. Vit. AUGUST. c. 5.

^b See BINGH. B. ii. c. xx. 11—7.

^c AUGUST. *de Doctrinâ Christianâ*, l. iv. c. 29. Sunt sane quidam, qui benè pronuntiare possunt, quid autem pro-

nuntient, excogitare non possunt. Quod si ab aliis sumant eloquenter sapienterque conscriptum, memoriæque commendent, utque ad populum proferant, si eam personam gerant, non improbè faciunt.

ARTICLE XXXVI.

Of the Consecration of Bishops and Ministers.

“ THE Book of Consecration of Archbishops and Bishops,
“ and ordering of Priests and Deacons, lately set forth in
“ the time of Edward the Sixth, and confirmed at the
“ same time by authority of Parliament, doth contain all
“ things necessary to such consecration and ordering;
“ neither hath it any thing that of itself is superstitious
“ and ungodly. And therefore whosoever are consecrated
“ or ordered according to the rites of that Book, since the
“ second year of the forenamed king Edward unto this
“ time, or hereafter shall be consecrated or ordered ac-
“ cording to the same rites; we decree all such to be
“ rightly, orderly, and lawfully consecrated and ordered.”

Part of this Article is retrospective, why it was so made need not now be explained; since by the Act of Uniformity passed in the fourteenth year of king Charles the second, it is enacted that all subscriptions to this Article shall be taken to extend and be applied to the book containing the form and manner of making, ordaining, and consecrating of bishops, priests, and deacons, now in use.

All that seems to be in this Article asserted, is, that the ordinations of the Church of England are valid: and this assertion involves two questions, first, the right of the bishops of our Church to or-

dain; and secondly, the propriety of the manner of ordaining used in our Church.

The first question, we willingly admit, includes the necessity of an Apostolical succession, but the fact, that in the Church of England that succession has been preserved, need not now be shewn^a. All therefore that remains to be proved is, that there is nothing in the manner of ordination observed among us inconsistent with the practice of the primitive Churches; or affirmatively, that, in conferring orders, every thing that is essential is retained and observed. The fitness of the aspirant to the office of the ministry being first ascertained, the manner of ordaining is, as will be seen it anciently was, by imposition of hands, and proper prayers. The fitness and propriety of the prayers used in our ordination services I do not think it necessary now to vindicate; let those, who have objections to make, satisfy their scruples by an attentive perusal of that portion of the learned work referred to in the last note, which treats of our Ordination Services.

First, then, *as to the Consecration of Bishops.*

Three bishops at least are required to be present at the consecration.

Herein the Church of England agrees with the

^a The Apostolic succession of the Bishops of the Reformed Church in England is clearly and ably established in the Rev. W. PALMER'S *Origines Liturgicæ*; the whole work

cannot be too strongly recommended to the perusal and oft repeated perusal of the learned members of our Apostolic Church.

primitive Churches. Cyprian mentions it as the general practice of the Church in his time for all the bishops of the same province to be present at the consecration:

“It is observed amongst us, and generally throughout all the provinces, that properly to celebrate an ordination, all the neighbouring bishops of the province meet together with the people of the diocese, over whom the bishop is ordained, and the bishop is chosen in the presence of the people^b.”

By the fourth canon of the Council of Nice all the bishops of the province were required to attend, if they could conveniently be present; if not, then, “in that case, three bishops shall be sufficient to ordain, provided the metropolitan and the rest send their consent in writing; but under three, the canons do not generally allow of^c.”

The fourth Council of Carthage, A. D. 399, provides as follows; “When a bishop is ordained, let two bishops place and hold the book of the Gospels over his head, and while one pronounces the benediction over him, all the rest of the bishops who are present, shall lay their hands upon his head^d.”

^b CYPRIAN. Ep. lxxvii. *ad Clorum in Hispan.* s. 6. Quod apud nos quoque et ferè per provincias universas teneatur, ut ad ordinationes ritè celebrandas, ad eam plebem cui præpositus ordinatur, episcopi ejusdem provinciæ proximi quique convenient, et episcopus deligatur plebe præsentē.

^c *Conc. Nic. Can. iv.*

^d *Conc. Carthag. iv. c. 2.* Episcopus cum ordinatur, duo Episcopi ponant et teneant Evangeliorum codicem super caput et verticem ejus, et uno super eum fundente benedictionem, reliqui omnes Episcopi, qui adsunt, manibus suis caput ejus tangant.

The fitness of our prayers for the occasion being taken for granted, the above extracts are sufficient to shew, that in the consecration of bishops the Church of England has adhered to the primitive practice.

Secondly, *as to the ordination of presbyters, or priests.*

The council of Carthage, quoted above, enjoins as follows: "When a presbyter is ordained, while the bishop pronounces the benediction, and lays his hand upon his head, all the presbyters, who are present, shall lay their hands, by the bishop's hand, upon his head also."

And it may be added, the author of the Apostolic Constitutions mentions prayer and imposition of hands as all that is requisite for the ordination of a presbyter, which exactly describes the practice of the Church of England.

"When thou, O bishop, ordainest a presbyter, do thou lay thy hand on his head, the presbytery and also the deacons standing by thee; and praying, say^r:"—then follows the prayer at length.

And the same agreement will be found in what we have lastly to speak of, the ordination of deacons.

^e *Conc. Carthag.* iv. c. 3. Presbyter cum ordinatur, Episcopo eum benedicente, et manum super caput ejus tenente, etiam omnes presbyteri, qui præsentes sunt, manus suas juxta manum Episcopi super caput illius teneant.

^r *Constit. Apostol.* l. viii. c. 16. Πρεσβύτερον χειροτονῶν, ὃ Ἐπίσκοπε, τὴν χεῖρα ἐπὶ τῆς κεφαλῆς ἐπιτίθει αὐτός—καὶ εὐχόμενος, λέγε·

“When a deacon is ordained, the bishop only, who pronounces the benediction over him, shall lay his hand upon his head; because he is not consecrated to the office of the priesthood, but to the ministry, or inferior services of the Church^g.”

To the above very imperfect illustration of the manner of ordination used in the Church of England, may be added a few passages on the subject of ordination generally.

Chrysostom says: “For this reason in the Church, at the ordination of priests, the Gospel of Christ is laid upon the head, that he who is ordained may learn that he receives the true crown of the Gospel; and that he may learn, that although he is the head of all, yet he is to act under these laws; and that ruling over all, he is himself subject to the law^h.”

And in another place: “This is ordination; the hand of a man is laid upon him: but God makes the whole effectual, and it is His hand which touches the head of the person ordained, if only he is ordained as he ought to beⁱ.”

^g *Conc. Carthag.* iv. c. 4. Diaconus quum ordinatur, solus Episcopus, qui eum benedicit, manum super caput illius ponat; quia non ad sacerdotium, sed ad ministerium consecratur.

^h CHRYSOST. *Hom. de Legislatore*, ed. Bened. tom. vi. p. 410. Διὰ τοῦτο ἐν τῇ ἐκκλησίᾳ ἐν ταῖς χειροτονίαις τῶν ἱερέων τὸ εὐαγγέλιον τοῦ Χριστοῦ ἐπὶ κεφαλῆς τίθεται, ἵνα μάθῃ ὁ χειροτονούμενος, ὅτι τὴν ἀληθινὴν τοῦ

εὐαγγελίου τιάραν λαμβάνει, καὶ ἵνα μάθῃ, εἰ καὶ πάντων ἐστὶ κεφαλὴ, ἀλλ' ὑπὸ τούτους πράττει τοὺς νόμους, πάντων κρατῶν, καὶ τῷ νόμῳ κρατούμενος.

ⁱ Idem, *Hom. xiv. in Acta Trost.* ed. Bened. p. 114. Αὐτὸ ἡ χειροτονία ἐστίν· ἡ χεὶρ ἐπίκειται τοῦ ἀνδρός· τὸ δὲ πᾶν ὁ Θεὸς ἐργάζεται, καὶ ἡ αὐτοῦ χεὶρ ἐστὶν ἡ ἀπτομένη τῆς κεφαλῆς τοῦ χειροτονουμένου, ἕαν, ὡς δεῖ, χειροτονῇται.

That of Jerome too is applicable, where he says :
 “ Ordination of the clergy is completed not only
 by prayer, but also the laying on of hands ; least
 a silent and secret prayer should ordain persons as
 clergymen without their knowledge^k.”

ARTICLE XXXVII.

Of the Civil Magistrates.

“ THE King’s Majesty hath the chief power in this realm
 “ of England, and other his dominions, unto whom the
 “ chief government of all estates of this realm, whether
 “ they be Ecclesiastical or Civil, in all causes doth apper-
 “ tain ; and is not, nor ought to be, subject to any foreign
 “ jurisdiction.

“ Where we attribute to the King’s Majesty the chief
 “ government, by which titles we understand the minds
 “ of some slanderous folks to be offended ; we give not to
 “ our Princes the ministering either of God’s word, or of
 “ the Sacraments : the which thing the injunctions also
 “ lately set forth by Elizabeth our Queen do most plainly
 “ testify. But that only prerogative, which we see to
 “ have been given always to all godly Princes in Holy
 “ Scriptures by God himself ; that is, that they should

^k HIERON. lib. xvi. in *Esai.*
 c. 58. p. 265. *Χειροτονία*, id
 est, ordinatio clericorum non
 solum ad imprecationem vocis,

sed ad impositionem impletur
 manûs : ne scilicet vocis impre-
 catio clandestina clericos ordinet
 nescientes.

“ rule all estates and degrees committed to their charge
“ by God, whether they be Ecclesiastical or Temporal,
“ and restrain with the civil sword the stubborn and evil-
“ doers.

“ The Bishop of Rome hath no jurisdiction in this
“ realm of England.

“ The laws of the realm may punish Christian men
“ with death, for heinous and grievous offences.

“ It is lawful for Christian men, at the command of the
“ Magistrate, to wear weapons, and serve in the wars.”

The object of the first three clauses of this Article is to assert the King's supremacy in all causes, as well ecclesiastical as civil, within this realm; and to deny any jurisdiction in the pope. The second clause is explanatory of the first, and was inserted only to remove the scruples of those “slandrous” folks, the Puritans; and therefore need not be further noticed in this place.

In illustrating this portion of the Article, a few passages may be given to shew that even the earliest Christians acknowledged the supreme authority of the civil power; and that after the emperors became converts to Christianity they exercised chief authority in ecclesiastical matters. It may then be shewn that in the first four centuries the Bishop of Rome's jurisdiction was limited to his own patriarchate.

The following passage from so early a martyr as Polycarp strongly manifests the loyalty of the Christians even in times of the severest persecution. He was on the point of suffering martyrdom, and offered to give the proconsul an account of the

Christian religion: “The proconsul said, ‘Persuade the people,’ but Polycarp answered, ‘To thee I have thought right to give a reason of my faith, for we are taught to pay all due honour, so as it does not injure ourselves, to authorities and powers ordained of God. But as for them (the people) I esteem them not worthy, that I should give an account to them^a.”

Tertullian in his book to Scapula, which was written for the purpose of dissuading the governor of Africa from continuing the persecution, which he had set on foot against the Christians, urges as a reason, that they pay entire obedience to the emperor; “A Christian is an enemy to no man, least of all to the emperor; knowing that he is established by his own God, he must needs love, respect, and honour him, and wish his preservation, with that of the whole Roman empire, as long as the world shall last.—We therefore reverence the emperor, so far as it is lawful for us and expedient to him, as a man who is next under God, and who has received from God whatever authority he hath, and as inferior to God only.—We offer sacrifices, therefore, for the safety of the emperor, but to our God and his; and in the way that God hath commanded us, by prayers only^b.”

^a *Epist. Eccl. Smyrn. de Martyr. S. Polycarpi*, s. 10.

—δεδιδάγμεθα γὰρ ἀρχαῖς καὶ ἑξουσίαις ὑπὸ τοῦ Θεοῦ τεταγμέναις τιμὴν κατὰ τὸ προσήκον, ἀπονέμειν—

^b TERTULL. *ad Scap.* c. 2.

Colimus ergo et imperatorem sic, quomodo et nobis licet et ipsi expedit, ut hominem à Deo secundum, et quicquid est, à Deo consecutum, solo Deo minorem—

And in his Apology he says :

“ We invoke for the safety of the emperor, the eternal, the true, the living God ; whom the emperors themselves had rather should be propitious to them above all other gods. They know who gave them their empire ; they know who made them be men ; who gave them life. They feel that he alone is God, in whose power only they are, from whom they are second, after whom they are first, before all and above all gods.—He (the emperor) is therefore great, because he is inferior to God. For he is of Him, of whom are both the heavens and all created things. Thence he is emperor, whence he is also man, before he was emperor ; thence is his power ; thence also his breath is derived. There we Christians looking up, with our hands stretched forth, because they are free from guilt ; with heads uncovered, because we are not ashamed ; last of all without a monitor, because we pray from our breast ; continually, and with one accord, offer up our prayers for all the emperors, that they may have a long life, a secure reign, a safe household, valiant soldiers, a faithful council, an upright people, a peaceable world, and, in short, whatever a man, and a emperor, can desire^c.”

No stronger proof of the authority of princes in ecclesiastical matters can reasonably be required, than the fact clearly established in the twenty-first Article, that by them general councils were

^c Idem, *Apol.* c. 30. —à primi, ante omnes et super quo sunt secundi, post quem omnes Deos—

summoned. These councils met for the sole purpose of taking into their consideration [matters relating to the Catholic Church; on what more solemn occasion could they be drawn together? and yet they came in obedience to the emperor's mandate, and as I shall now shew, further acknowledged his supremacy by petitioning him to confirm and ratify their decrees.

The second general council, held at Constantinople A. D. 381, we have seen, met at the command of the emperor Theodosius; and thus they ask him to ratify their decrees: "We have appointed certain canons for the good government of Churches; all of which we have subjoined to this our letter. We therefore entreat of your clemency, that the vote of the synod may be ratified by the subscription of your piety, that as you have honoured the Church by your letters of summons, so you may also put your seal to the things that are decreed ^d."

Again, the bishops who met at the council of Ephesus A. D. 431, thus write to the emperors Theodosius and Valentinian: "We all fly to the power of your piety, entreating you that the decrees against Nestorius and his party may be enforced; and that the proceedings of those who side with him may be null and void ^e."

^d *Conc. Constantinopol. in Canon. Tiguri editis, p. 36.*—

Δεόμεθα τοίνυν τῆς σῆς ἡμερότητος, γράμματι τῆς σῆς εὐσεβείας ἐπικυρωθῆναι τῆς συνόδου τὴν ψῆφον, ὡς ὡς περ τοῖς τῆς ἐκλήσεως γράμμασι τὴν ἐκκλησίαν τετίμηκας, οὕτω καὶ

τῶν δοξάντων ἐπισφραγίσας τὸ τέλος.

^e *Concil. Ephes. Καταφεύγομεν ἅπαντες ἐπὶ τὸ κράτος τῆς ὑμετέρας εὐσεβείας, δεόμενοι τὰ μὲν κατὰ Νέστοριον πεπραγμένα, καὶ τῶν τὰ Νεστορίου*

If the acknowledgement of the whole Church, represented in a general council does not satisfy the Romanists, there are abundant instances of the same authority being exercised in provincial councils. To instance that of Tyre, A. D. 335., (with the validity of whose decrees we are not now concerned,) the emperor Constantine writes to the members assembled in council as follows: “If any one, which however I do not suppose, should attempt even now to reject our summons, and should not choose to be present, one shall be sent dispatched hence by us, who will eject him by our imperial mandate, and shew him that it is not fitting to resist the decrees of the emperor published on behalf of the truth^f.”

To these we may add the account given us by the historian Socrates, and which has been before adduced; “From the time that the emperors became Christians, the affairs of the Church depended on them, and the greatest councils both were and still are gathered together by their command^g.”

We now proceed to shew that the Bishop of Rome hath no jurisdiction in this realm of England.

This would be most satisfactorily proved by tracing the rise of the Pope’s power in England from the seventh century downwards; but as that

φρονούντων ἔχειν τὴν ἰσχὺν, τὰ δὲ περὶ τῶν ἐκδικούντων μένειν ἀπρακ-
τα καὶ ἀργά.

^f THEODORET. *Hist. Eccl.*
l. i. c. 27. p. 578. Ἐάν τις, ὡς
ἔγωγε οὐκ οἶμαι, τὴν ἡμετέραν
κέλευσιν καὶ νῦν διακρούσασθαι
πειρώμενος, μὴ βουλευθῇ παραγε-

νέσθαι, ἐντεῦθεν παρ’ ἡμῶν, απο-
σταλήσεται, ὃς ἐκ βασιλικοῦ προστάγ-
ματος αὐτὸν ἐκβαλὼν, ὡς οὐ
προσῆκον ὕροις αὐτοκράτορος ὑπὲρ
τῆς ἀληθείας ἐξενεχθεῖσιν ἀντιτείνεν
διδάξει.

^g Ante, p. 358.

course is inconsistent with the plan of this work, it must suffice to shew that for the first four centuries the bishop of Rome's jurisdiction was limited to his own patriarchate^h."

The rule laid down by the first general council at Nice, is enough to decide the whole matter; "Let ancient customs prevail; in Egypt, Libya, and Pentapolis, let the bishop of Alexandria have authority over all, because the same is customary with the bishop of Rome: in like manner at Antioch, and in other provinces, let the privileges be secured to the Churchesⁱ."

To this decision of a council, whose authority is recognised by the Church of Rome, may be added a few passages from individual writers.

Tertullian so far from considering the Romish church as the sole court of appeal, recommends, as a mode of refuting heresies, a reference to the doctrine included in those churches, which were founded by the Apostles themselves; "Now would you exercise your curiosity to better purpose in the business of your salvation, run through the Apostolic Churches, in which the very chairs, in which the Apostles sat, are now filled; where their authentic Epistles are read, conveying the sound

^h It is not necessary in this place to notice the contested distinction between patriarchal and metropolitical power; if there be any substantial difference between the two, the reader may make his choice; either will equally serve our present purpose.

ⁱ Conc. Nic. Con. vi. Τὰ ἀρχαῖα ἔθνη κρατεῖται, τὰ ἐν Ἀιγύπτῳ, καὶ Λιβύῃ, καὶ Πενταπόλει, ὥστε τὸν ἐν Ἀλεξανδρείᾳ ἐπίσκοπον πάντων τούτων ἔχειν τὴν ἐξουσίαν· ἐπειδὴν καὶ τῷ ἐν τῇ Ῥώμῃ ἐπισκόπῳ τοῦτο σύνηθές ἐστιν.—

of their voices, and the representation of their persons. Is Achaia near you? you have Corinth. If you are not far from Macedonia, you have Philippi, you have the Thessalonians. If you can pass over to Asia, you have Ephesus; but if you are near Italy, you have Rome, whence we also can have an authority at hand. Happy Church, to which the Apostles poured forth all their doctrine, with their blood^k."

It is unfortunate for the Romanists, that the supposed derivation of the pope's supremacy from St. Peter, compels them to shew the acknowledgment of his jurisdiction by Churches without the limits of his patriarchate, from the earliest times. They consequently cannot do without the authority of Cyprian; and Pamelius has certainly made the most of him. If he addresses the bishop of Rome as his "brother," it must be explained away; if he calls him, as he frequently does, "Papa," there is no longer room for doubt. Without entering into these minutiae, a few decisive extracts will vindicate the independency of the African bishops.

The Roman clergy write thus to Cyprian in answer to a letter from him. "Although a mind conscious of its own rectitude; and that relies on the strength of the Gospel discipline, and that is

^k TERTULL. *de Præscript. Hæret.* c. 36. Age jam, qui voles curiositatem melius exercere, in negotio salutis tuæ, percurrere Ecclesias Apostolicas, apud quas ipsæ adhuc cathedræ Apostolorum suis locis præsi-

dentur, apud quas authenticæ literæ eorum recitantur, sonantes vocem, repræsentantes faciem. Proxima est tibi Achaia? habes Corinthum, etc.

its own true witness of its having performed the decrees of heaven, is wont to be content with God as its only judge, and not to seek the praises of another, nor to fear his accusations; yet they are deserving of twofold praise, who, although they know that they must give account to God alone as their judge, yet are desirous that their acts should be approved of by their brethren. That you should do this, brother Cyprian, is not surprising, who from your innate modesty and zeal, have wished to find in us not so much judges of, as partakers in, your counsels; that while we approve of what you have done we may share the credit with you¹." The letter concludes: "We wish, most blessed and glorious pope, that you may always be prosperous in the Lord, and ever mindful of us."

Cyprian writes to Cornelius, bishop of Rome, complaining of the conduct of certain heretics and schismatics:

"Afterwards the heretics, having constituted for themselves a false bishop, dare to sail, and to take letters from schismatics and profane men to the chair of Peter, and to the principal Church whence the unity of the priesthood arose, nor did they consider that they are Romans, (whose faith the Apostle extolled,) to whom perfidy can have no access. We all determined, and our determination is alike equitable and just, that the cause of each should be heard there, where the offence was committed, and

¹ CLER. ROM. *Cypriano* non tam judices voluisti, quam
Papæ, Ep. xxxi. s. 1. ——— participes inveniri. ———
 qui—consiliorum tuorum nos

that to the several pastors a portion of the flock should be given, for each to rule and govern, and of which he must give account to the Lord; it therefore behoves those over whom we are, not to run about to all parts, nor by their crafty and fallacious temerity to make a breach in the concord of the bishops^m."

Strange to say Pamelius in his note on the first part of this passage, urges it as an acknowledgment that all weightier causes concerning the faith are to be referred to the Roman Church, and still further that that Church cannot err in the faith. But, without troubling ourselves with the arguments of Pamelius, is it possible that on the authority now before us, the bishop of Rome should try any offences that were not committed in his immediate jurisdiction?

Again, Cyprian in the council of Carthage uses these expressions:

"For neither doth any one of us set himself up for a Bishop of Bishops, nor by any tyrannical terror compel his colleagues (or fellow bishops) into a necessity of submitting themselves to him; since every bishop is at liberty to use his power according to his discretion, and can no more be judged by another, than he can himself judge another. But let us all look for the judgment of our Lord Jesus Christ, who alone hath the power both of advancing

^m CYPR. Ep. lv. *ad Cornelium*. s. 16. — Nam cum statutum sit omnibus nobis, et æquum sit pariter ac justum,

ut uniuscujusque causa illic audiatur, ubi est crimen admissum. —

us to the government of his Church, and of judging us for what we do in the exercise of our officeⁿ.”

I cannot forbear extracting the following few lines from Chrysostom, for the purpose of shewing at what straws the members of the Church of Rome will catch :

“How many kings,” says Chrysostom, “have built cities, have formed harbours, and, having given them their own names, have died? they however have reaped no benefit, but are given over to silence and oblivion. But Peter the fisherman, having done nothing of this sort, since he followed after virtue, and dwelt in the most royal city, shines, even after death, more bright than the sun^o.”

The mention of “the most royal city,” elicits the following confident remark from Fronto Ducæus, “*Nempe Romam, velint nolint Lutherani et Calvinisti^p.*”

It is scarcely worth while to draw a sharp or a strong weapon out of Chrysostom’s armoury to annihilate this rebellious little braggart, I will therefore just match it with one of the same stamp; he says to the Christians of Antioch: “Think of the greatness of the city, and that we have not now to consider about one, or two, or three, or ten souls,

ⁿ *Conc. Carthag.* ap. CYPR. Neque enim quisquam nostrum Episcopum se esse Episcoporum constituit, aut tyrannico terrore ad obsequendi necessitatem collegas suos adigit, quando habeat omnis Episcopus pro licentia libertatis et potes-

tatis suæ arbitrium proprium, tamque judicari ab alio non possit, quam nec ipse potest alterum judicare.—

^o CHRYSOST. in *Ps.* xlviii.

^p *Antverpiæ*, 1723. vol. iii. p. 237. C.

but of endless myriads of the *head of the whole world*, this is the city in which the name of Christian was first adopted; honour Christ, reverence the city which first preached this desirable and sweet name to all mankind; this was the meeting place of the Apostles, the dwelling place of the righteous¹. *Nempe Antiochiam velint, nolint Romani et Fronto-Ducæus.*

We may now proceed to the last two clauses of the Article.

With the exception of Lactantius, I believe, none of the early Fathers question the right of the civil power to inflict capital punishments. Though little is to be found on the subject, there is a passage in Irenæus, and another in Augustine, which directly assert the magistrates' authority in this matter.

“Because man departing from God became so violent, that he looked upon those of his own flesh and blood as his enemies, and was not afraid to give himself up to an unpeaceable life, to murder and avarice. God imposed upon him the fear of man, (for they knew not the fear of God,) so that men being subject to, and restrained by, the laws of men, there might be something of justice and good government amongst them, as being terrified by the sword, which was publicly set before them: according to what the Apostle says: ‘For he beareth not the sword in vain, For he is the minister

¹ CHRYSOST. *ad Pop. Antioch.* Hom. iii. — ἀλλὰ περὶ μυριάδων ἀπειρών, περὶ τοῦ κεφα-

λαίου τῆς οἰκουμένης ἀπάσης. Αὐτῇ ἡ πόλις ἔστιν, ἐν ᾗ, κ. τ. λ.

of God, a revenger to execute wrath upon him that doeth evil.' And the magistrates being for this end invested with the laws of justice, shall not be questioned or punished, for whatever they shall justly and lawfully do¹."

"They have by no means violated the commandment, which says, 'Thou shalt do no murder,' who have waged war by the command of God, or who holding an office of public magistracy, have punished malefactors with death, according to the laws of the state, that is, according to the rule of the most just reason²."

Lastly ; Christians are nowhere forbidden by the canons of the Church to serve in the wars : it is not probable that in the primitive times any converts to Christianity would voluntarily engage in a military life, though it is very certain that many who were in the military service before their conversion, continued so afterwards.

Tertullian, as was before observed³, in his treatise *de Coronâ Militis*, maintains it to be unlawful for a Christian to bear arms ; yet it is clear from that treatise that in his time many Christians were soldiers, and in his Apology he expressly asserts that they did serve in the wars, and moreover

² IRENÆUS, l. v. c. xxiv. s. 2. Et propter hoc et ipsi magistratus indumentum justitiæ leges habentes, quæcunque justè et legitimè fecerint, de his non interrogabuntur, neque pœnas dabunt.

³ AUGUST. *de Civit. Dei*. l. i. c. 21. Nequaquam con-

tra hoc præceptum fecerunt, quo dictum est *Non occides*, qui, Deo auctore bella gesserunt, aut personam gerentes publicæ potestatis, secundum ejus leges, hoc est justissimæ rationis imperium, sceleratos morte punierunt.

¹ Ante, Article VI.

urges this, as one amongst other grounds, why they should not be persecuted. They were accused of being useless in public affairs, he answers: "We sail with you, we serve in the wars with you, we engage in agricultural, and mercantile pursuits, and besides we employ ourselves in manufactures; and make our labours available to the public. How therefore we can seem to be of no use in your affairs, with whom, and on whose account we live, I cannot understand."

In the passage last cited from Augustine, we have seen, he justifies a recourse to war on necessary occasions; and elsewhere he expresses himself very strongly on the subject: "It differs much for what reasons, and by what authority, men take upon themselves to go to war: the natural order of things, which is adapted to the peace of mankind, requires, that the power and discretion of going to war should rest with the prince: but soldiers, for the sake of the public peace and safety, ought to obey the military commands of their governor." He then says, that unjust wars though wicked, are permitted by God, and continues: "Since therefore a righteous man, if he happens to serve under a sacrilegious king, may properly engage in war at the king's command; for he upholds the order of the public peace, and the orders that are given him, either are certainly not against the command of God, or at all events it is not certain that they are, so that the wickedness of

^u TERTULL. *Apol.* c. 42. Navigamus et nos vobiscum, et militamus.—

the mandate may make the king guilty, but the necessity of obedience will shew the soldier to be innocent : if this be so, how much more one may innocently engage in wars, which God has commanded, no one can doubt^x."

ARTICLE XXXVIII.

Of Christian Men's goods, which are not common.

"THE riches and goods of Christians are not common, as touching the right, title, and possession of the same, as certain Anabaptists do falsely boast. Notwithstanding every man ought, of such things as he possesseth, liberally to give alms to the poor, according to his ability."

The notion here condemned, that Christians should have all things in common, was not novel at the period of the reformation. As early as the second century of the Christian era, a sect calling themselves Apostolici, because they professed rigidly to follow the example of the Apostles, but better known by the name of Apotactici or Re-

^x AUGUST. c. *Faust.* l. xxii. c. 75. Interest enim quibus causis quibusque auctoribus homines gerenda bella suscipi-

ant—Cum ergo vir justus, si fortè sub rege homine etiam sacrilego militet, rectè possit illo jubente bellare, etc.

nouncers, obliged all men, who would give in to their opinions, to renounce all right to any worldly property whatsoever: and in the fourth century the Eustathians, so called from their leader Eustathius, a monk, held the same doctrine.

It is scarcely necessary to prove that the primitive Churches admitted no such principle: but a few passages may be adduced in support of the Article generally.

Tertullian having given a general account of the forms of Christian worship, proceeds: "Every one contributes a moderate alms, monthly, or whenever he pleases, if only he does please, and has the power to do so; for no one is compelled, but gives of his own free will. These, as it were, are the contributions of piety, for they are not afterwards spent in banqueting, nor in drinking, nor in wasteful extravagance, but in maintaining and burying the poor, and destitute orphans, and those who are disabled from old age, and those that are shipwrecked, or who are condemned to work in the mines, or are banished into the islands, or are confined in prison, so as they suffer for having embraced the Christian religion ^a."

Chrysostom having observed that air, water, fire, the sun, and other things of that kind are common to all men, proceeds; "For what reason then hath God made the greater and more neces-

^a TERTULL. *Apol.* c. 39. Modicam unusquisque stipem menstruâ die, vel quum velit, et si modo velit, et si modo

possit, apponit; nam nemo compellitur, sed sponte confert.—

sary things, and those which support life, common, but the lesser and more vile, I mean worldly possessions, are not common? For what reason! That our life may be well ordered, and we may have a stage for the exercise of virtue. For if these necessary things were not in common, the rich perhaps, using their wonted covetousness, would cause those that are poor to perish. For if they do this with their worldly possessions, much more would they do it with other things. On the other hand if worldly possessions were also in common, and were the property of all men alike, all occasion of alms-doing, and opportunity of benevolence, would be taken away. That we may be secure of life therefore, the things that are the causes of our living, have been given to us all in common: again, that we may have an occasion to obtain crowns and praise, worldly possessions have not been made common, in order that hating covetousness, and following after righteousness, and giving of our substance to those that are in want, we may by these means obtain some relief for our sins. God hath made thee rich, why makest thou thyself poor? He made thee rich, that by thy bounty to others thou mightest acquit thy own sins. He gave thee worldly possessions, not that thou mightest hoard them up to thy own destruction, but that thou mightest pour them forth for thy own salvation ^b."

^b CHRYSOST. *ad Pop.* κοινὰ πεποίηκεν ὁ Θεός, τὰ δὲ ἐλάτ-
Antioch. Hom. ii. Τίνος οὖν τονα καὶ εὐτελέστερα οὐκ ἔστι κοινὰ,
 ἔνεκεν τὰ μὲν μείζονα, καὶ ἀναγκαϊό- τὰ χρήματα λέγω; κ. τ. λ.
 τερα, καὶ τὴν ζωὴν ἡμῶν συνέχοντα,

Augustine places the Apostolici who were mentioned above in the list of heretics: "The Apostolici, who have most arrogantly called themselves by that name, because they would receive none into their communion who lived in the conjugal state, and who possess private property;— But therefore they are heretics, because they separate themselves from the Church, and think that those, who practise the things which they do not, have no hope of salvation. They are like the Encratites, for they are also called Apotactites^e."

ARTICLE XXXIX.

Of a Christian Man's Oath.

"As we confess, that vain and rash swearing is forbidden
 "Christian men by our Lord Jesus Christ, and James
 "his Apostle; so we judge, that Christian religion doth
 "not prohibit, but that a man may swear when the
 "Magistrate requireth, in a cause of faith and charity, so
 "it be done according to the Prophet's teaching, in jus-
 "tice, judgment, and truth."

Though some passages will be presently adduced from which it will appear, that Christians from the

^e AUGUST. *de Hær.* c. xl.— recipere utentes conjugibus,
 in suam communionem non et res proprias possidentes.

earliest times were allowed to swear on the occasions contemplated by this Article, yet it must be admitted that many of the Fathers use very strong language in reprobation of oaths. A modern writer^a, who has paid great attention to the subject generally, but who does not seem to have consulted the works of the Fathers to any great extent, says that “Among others, Chrysostom, Theodoret, Epiphanius, Basil, and Theophylact, seem to have considered our Lord’s words as peremptorily forbidding all oaths.—” In a note, however, this author says, “It may admit of a doubt whether the strong expressions to be found in the works of some of these Fathers were not chiefly employed in reference to the Heathen oaths, by which many professed Christians bound themselves in those early times, as well as in later ages.” I cannot pretend to decide with regard to Theodoret, or Theophylact, but for the rest I should say, they nowhere forbid Christians to take oaths, where the civil power enjoins them to be taken; nor do I think their remarks had reference chiefly to the heathen oaths, but to the daily habits of swearing in which many indulged. A passage or two from Chrysostom illustrating the above opinion, and which are to be found in Suicer, shall be given in their proper place.

The imperial laws required all persons who were witnesses in any cause to be put on their oath, and as the early Christian writers never dispute such laws, as militating against the law of God, their

^a The Rev. James Hendel Tyler.

silence shews that they did not think such a practice forbidden.

Clemens Alexandrinus uses very strong expressions against the practice of swearing: he does not particularise oaths administered in courts of justice; it is clear however, from the following passage, that Christians did swear on solemn occasions; "The Christian indeed religiously observes an oath, but he is not subject to swear, as being seldom prevailed upon to swear at all^b."

It cannot be doubted that before Christianity became the religion of the Roman empire, the Christians would be required to take the oaths in the usual form, the imperial laws would not bend to their despised and persecuted faith. A passage in Tertullian shews that while they scrupled to take an oath which was expressed in a manner that derogated from the majesty of God, they did not hesitate to swear in terms to which no such objection could be made. He says: "We swear, moreover, although not by the genii of the Cæsars, yet by their safety; which is more august than all the genii in the world. Are you ignorant that the genii are called devils. In the emperors we acknowledge the appointment of God, who set them over the nations; we know that in them is that which God willed; and therefore we wish their safety, which God willed, and we account that a solemn oath. But for the demons, that is, the

^b CLEM. ALEX. Stron. l. vii. s. 8. p. 862. Εὐσεβὺς μὲν, οὐ μὴν ἐνεπίφορος ἐπὶ τὸ ὀμνῆναι ὁ

γνωστικὸς, ὅγε σπανίως ἐπὶ τὸ ὀμνῆναι ἀφικνούμενος.

genii, we are used to adjure them that we may cast them out of the bodies of men; not to swear by them, so as to confer divine honour upon them^c.”

Athanasius, in his *Apology* addressed to the emperor Constantius, in answer to his accusers, says: “I answer with a loud and clear voice, and with an outstretched hand, which I learnt from the Apostle, I call God to witness upon my soul, and as it is written in the books of Kings, I conceive the oath, Be the Lord my witness, and be his Christ my witness, that I never made mention of you to your evil^d.”

Further on he says: “I wish this man, whoever he is, were here in your presence, that the oath might be put to him, and I might examine him under the attestation of the truth. For those things which we speak as if God were present, such things we Christians are used to declare under this form of an oath^e.”

The passages in Chrysostom to which I alluded are these: “Let us impose upon ourselves laws for every day; and let us at once begin from those that are easy. Let us cut off from our mouth the evil and constant habit of swearing: let us put a

^c TERTULL. *Apol.* c. 32. Sed et juramus, sicut non per genios Cæsarum, ita per salutem eorum, quæ est augustior omnibus geniis. — pro magno id juramento habemus.

^d ATHANAS. *ad Imperat. Constantium.* *Apol.* s. 3. — τὴν

χεῖρα ἐκτείνας, ὃ μεμάθηκα παρὰ τοῦ Ἀποστόλου, μάρτυρα τὸν Θεὸν ἐπικαλοῦμαι, ἐπὶ τὴν ἐμὰν ψυχὴν — μάρτυς Κύριος, καὶ μάρτυς ὁ Χριστὸς αὐτοῦ.

^e Idem, *ibid.* s. 8. — ἃ γὰρ ὡς Θεοῦ παρόντος λαλοῦμεν, τοῦτον ὄρκον ἔχομεν ἡμεῖς οἱ Χριστιανοί.

bridle upon our tongue ; let no one swear by God. There is here no need of expense, here no labour is required ; no length of time is necessary ; it is enough to resolve, and the whole is done^f.”

Again : “ With a loud and a clear voice I declare to all, I call all to witness, that those who are guilty of this sin, that those who speak the things that come from the Evil one, for such is an oath, shall not enter the threshold of the Church : the present month is your appointed time for correcting you in this practice. Say not to me, ‘ the urgency of my affairs compels me, because my word is not believed.’ Away with those who swear from custom, etc. ^g”

I know of no place in which Chrysostom distinctly forbids swearing in a court of justice : I know of no place in which he uses stronger language than in the above passages. And it is not possible to read them, and suppose that he was speaking of any thing more than the habit of swearing ; he would not appoint a month for breaking through the custom of swearing in courts of law ; he is therefore clearly condemning the evil practice of confirming their assertions in their

^f CHRYSOST. in *Acta Apost.*
Hom. viii. ed. Bened. tom. ix.
p. 66. Θῶμεν ἑαυτοῖς νόμους
καθημερινούς, τέως ἀπὸ τῶν εὐκόλων
ἀρξώμεθα· Περικόψωμεν ἡμῶν τὴν
πολυορκίαν τοῦ στόματος, χαλινὸν
ἐπιθῶμεν τῇ γλώττῃ, μηδεὶς ὁμνύτω
τὸν Θεόν.—

^g Idem, *ibid.* Μεγάλῃ καὶ
λαμπρᾷ τῇ φωνῇ κηρύττω πᾶσι

καὶ διαμαρτύρομαι, ὥστε, τοὺς τὴν
παράβασιν ταύτην ἐπιδεικνυμένους,
τοὺς τὰ ἐκ τοῦ πονηροῦ φεγγομένους·
τοῦτο γὰρ ἐστὶν ὁ ὅρκος· τῶν οὐδὲν
μὴ ἐπιβαίνειν τῶν ἐκκλησιαστικῶν
προθεσμία δὲ ὑμῖν ἔστω, ὃ μὴν ὁ
παρὼν, ὥστε κατορθῶσαι· μὴ γὰρ
μοι εἴπῃς, ὅτι μὲ ἡ τῶν πραγμάτων
ἀνάγκη κατεπείγει, ὅτι ἀπιστοῦμαι.—

private dealings with one another, with the sanction of an unnecessary oath.

To the above may be added a passage from Augustine, who says :

“ Avoid swearing as much as you can. For it is better not to swear even to what is true, than to accustom one’s self to swearing, by which men often fall into perjury, and are always in danger of so doing. But there are some persons, who, as I can perceive by their talk, are entirely ignorant of what an oath is. For they imagine that they do not swear, when they use such expressions as these : ‘ God knoweth,’ or ‘ God is my witness,’ or ‘ I call God for a record upon my soul.’ Because, as they allege, in these cases, they dont say ‘ By God,’ and because such expressions as I just now mentioned, are found in the writings of St. Paul. But even such words as they confess to be swearing are found there too. For thus the Apostle saith, ‘ I protest by your rejoicing which I have in Christ Jesus our Lord, I die daily.’” In the original Greek this sentence is manifestly expressed in the form of an oath. This I observe, that no one may imagine that the words ‘ By your rejoicing,’ are like these ‘ By my coming again to you,’ and the like, in which we say ‘ By a thing,’ without swearing. But we must not therefore trifle with oaths, because St. Paul, a man of unshaken veracity, swore in his Epistles. For, as I said before, it is much safer for us not to swear at all ; and as our Lord advises us to ‘ let our communication be yea, yea, nay, nay.’ Not because it is a sin to swear to what is

true, but because it is a most grievous sin to swear falsely, which that man is most likely to be guilty of, who is accustomed to swear^h."

^h AUGUST. Ep. clvii. (al. lxxvix.) s. 40. *ad Hilar.* Non jurare: sed quia gravissimum peccatum est, falsum jurare.
quia peccatum est, verum

THE END.



